UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Chief Phases of Pennsylvania Politics in the Jacksonian Period

BY

MARGUERITE G. BARTLETT

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

H. RAY HAAS & CO.
Printers and Publishers
Allentown, Pa.
1919

To Dr. Thomas Lynch Montgomery
whose kindness and courtesy
made our pleasant days spent at the
State Library,
the author

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Chief Phases of Pennsylvania Politics in the Jacksonian Period

BY

MARGUERITE G. BARTLETT

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

H. RAY HAAS & CO.
Printers and Publishers
Allentown, Pa.
1919

Copyright, 1919

by

MARGUERITE G. BARTLETT

PREFACE

In the state of Pennsylvania, the Jacksonian epoch witnessed the rise of a new party, the regeneration of an old party and the union of both. In the origin and development of the Whigs—a party formed of many elements, the period saw the restoration of a two party system in politics. The Whigs or Coalitionists were arrayed in opposition to the Democratic Republicans, who at this time of the state's history, and under the abbreviated name, Democrats, reached the culmination of their power. Their thoroughgoing organization made the state of Pennsylvania a power to reckon with in presidential elections.[1] The party brought into closer cooperation federal and state politicians and established a firmer unison between the nation and the state. The party owed its entity not to organization alone, rather more to its common adoration of the great Democratic leader, the soldier president, whose personality dominates the age to the exclusion of that of all other renowned public men. Few Pennsylvania leaders of the time were eminent as statesmen. Many, as worthy politicians and zealous partisan workers, contributed to the maintenance of Jacksonian supremacy and thus interest us as typifying a phase of the political life of the day. Other leaders typify the age in their espousal of extreme democratic measures, for the age was characterized by exaggerated democratic tendencies. It was at this time that the people of the state were to discover that extreme democracy had its victims as well as its proteges. Every sort of monopoly was feared. In the name of democracy, the Second United States Bank was threatened, assailed, and finally

[1] Mss., Buchanan—February 23, 1827; July 11, 1827; Mss., Van Buren —November 3, 1829—Letter from Fayette County.

ruined. In the name of democracy, the Ancient and Honorable Institution of Free Masonry was reviled and discredited. The political emancipation and social equality of the Negro was a question of serious debate in the constitutional convention which met in 1837. The time, then, was one of social and political unrest, fostered by ideas of excessive democracy.

Private ownership of canals and railroads was frowned upon with the utmost severity. In this period, Pennsylvania built her great system of Internal Communication with the West. The state itself undertook the work in all its details. Her system of financing the project and of publishing the records of expenditure, from the salary of the highest state commissioner to the price of the smallest implement of construction contrasts strikingly with methods then obtaining in England, and later in more modern times in our own country.

All of these questions, it may here be added, have been treated only in their partisan aspect as influencing the political life of the state in the period of Jackson's control.

The opening chapter introduces the political parties, emphasizing the struggle of the National Republicans to throw off their hereditary name, Federalist, and the efforts of the Democrats to canvass every locality in the state. We see the Antimasons coming to the fore as a third party of no mean power to sway elections. A later chapter shows the union of the Anti-Jackson groups under the good old name, Whig.

In chapter two, the Bank question receives separate treatment as a paramount political issue.

The "American System" in all its amplifications is dealt with in chapter four. Here the tariff figures only in its partisan character, and citations occur of the opinion of leading Pennsylvania politicians regarding the South Carolina Nullification. The completion of Internal Improvements being purely a state venture could not be disassociated from politics.

With the inauguration of a new state constitution, the subject is concluded. The debates, lengthy and stormy, which characterized the proceedings of the convention are touched upon only to indicate the prejudices of the politicians of the day. Their views are sketched on such familiar problems as the use of the German language in the public schools, the treatment of conscientious objectors, the observance of the Sabbath, and the extension of the franchise.

Throughout the entire study, the attempt to mold public opinion has been stressed. Popular prejudices in all their crude exaggerations have been dragged from hiding to throw light on the trend of the times. The role played by the Pennsylvania "Germans"—so called, as evinced by the long line of "German" governors, has not been obscured. Traces of Anti-British sentiment have been placed in their true setting.

In discovering the attitude of the people of the state and the action of politicians, full use has been made of partisan newspapers. The periodicals on file in Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Lancaster, and Doylestown furnished entertaining material. At the Library of Congress may be found the papers of Thaddeus Stevens, which, however, proved disappointing for this period. The manuscript letters of Van Buren and Jackson were a source of information. Most of the material here utilized has been derived from the private, unofficial and unpublished letters of Buchanan, Wolf, Ritner and lesser lights. The "Governor's Papers" in Manuscript at the State Library were of no small value.

This subject was suggested by Dr. William Roy Smith of Bryn Mawr College. At the University of Pennsylvania, further encouragement and assistance was generously given by Dean Herman V. Ames, Professor John Bach McMaster, and Dr. Albert E. McKinley.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/chiefphasesofpen00bart

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

Parties and Partisan Practices

The National Republicans—The struggle for a party name —"Federal"—a term of opprobrium for both branches of the Democratic-Republicans—The Democratic-Republicans—The elections of 1828—Democratic Expectations and Administration propaganda—Election Returns—The Rise of the Anti-Masons, their spread into Pennsylvania—The Gubernatorial Campaign of 1829—The Democratic Convention—the rejection of the Chester County Delegates—The results of the election—The strength of the Anti-Masons as a political party—Preparations for the campaigns of 1832.

CHAPTER II

Party Loyalty, and an Important Political Issue

The Second United States Bank, a party issue. The hereditary opposition of the Democrats to a national Bank. The hostile attitude of Jackson. The prejudices of the people. The effect of the Bank War on public opinion, and on the fortunes of the Democratic Party. English Contemporary Opinion. "The United States Bank of Pennsylvania."

CHAPTER III

Whig Coalition and Democratic Schism

The elections of 1834—attempts to form a Whig-Antimasonic union. The gubernatorial campaign of 1835—the threatened schism in the Democratic lines—the Wolf faction—the Muhlenburg faction. Failure of attempts to unite the party. The united opposition—the merging of the Whigs and the "all-sorts-party."

CHAPTER IV

The American System and Local Politics

"The American System" advocated in Whig campaign literature. "The Anti-American System" attributed to the Democrats. The American System identified with Pennsylvania interests. Democrats ignore the issue. The state wide popularity of the System. Protection especially favoured in the East. The Democrats non-committal on the tariff. The effect of Nullification on Jackson's popularity. The place of the Internal Improvement policy in local politics. State financing and Anti-Administration criticism. A contemporary non-political appreciation. Political jealousy.

CHAPTER V

The Third Constitutional Convention and Old Political Problems

The Calling of the Convention. Its personnel. Questions debated—The extension of the suffrage; Representation and Apportionment; Legislative, Executive and Judicial Reforms; Free Masonry; Lottery Tickets; Duelling; Observance of the Sabbath; Conscientious Objectors; Public Schools and the German Language; Internal Improvements. The New Constitution. Ratification.

CHAPTER I

Parties and Partisan Practices

In the prosaic world of politics, the name by which a political party is designated may be of great significance. The recognition and use of the name even by opponents may be of still greater concern. The Pennsylvania of Jacksonian days saw a party's struggle to throw off an older and more appropriate cognomen to secure the general acceptance of a more winning appellation. The party which opposed Jackson in 1828 suffered under a name antiquated and unpopular, though appropriate. Perceiving that its logical name was not popular, it sought to find for itself a new name less pleasing to its enemies. It struggled in vain to shake off the term "Federalist," reminiscent of less glorious, and even decadent days. More than once a political party has struggled to free itself of an appropriate name supplanting it by one which it is the part of wisdom to adopt. During the Middle Period in American history, the term Federalist was perhaps as opprobrious as the designation Tory in England after 1832. In both cases, decrepit parties were impelled to seek shelter in appellations less odious even if less appropriate.

Party designations

"Federalist" was the fitting name of the political group which opposed Jackson in 1828. In principle and in practice, the party was, on the whole, the logical successor, if not the remnant of the old Federalist Party of the days of Washington and Adams. They advocated policies which represented the teachings of Hamilton rather than those of Jefferson. Especially is this true in regard to the attitude assumed toward the continued existence of the two United States Banks—institutions

"Federalist," the logical name for the Anti-Jacksonians

destined to be opposed with increasing bitterness by Jeffersonians and later by their descendants, the Democrats of Jacksonian days. The opposing party—that other political branch which adhered to the more liberal interpretation of the constitution sanctioned by Hamilton, continued with few exceptions to further the interests of the fiscal institution fathered by their leader. The rechartering of the national bank formed the paramount political issue during Jackson's presidential terms, and the party which was strong in its support might well be regarded as the true heir of the Federalist Party of the days of Hamilton. Other considerations lead us to identify this Anti-Jackson Party as the heir of Federalistic principles. They advocated, on the whole, a broader interpretation of the constitution than did the Jackson adherents; and this, too, at a time when they were out of office and might naturally limit administrationists as had been the practice in the past. They supported the "American System" of Henry Clay; this was notably true in western Pennsylvania where the Anti-Jackson press, speaking for the iron and wool interests, demanded protection. Government support for the completion of a vast system of Internal Improvements which would unite the western parts of the state with the eastern and bring trade to towns along the way was a part of the policy of those who supported Clay or other Anti-Jackson candidates. Principles of broad construction, then, were a feature of the party which in 1828 seemed to have but one object—opposition to Jackson as a presidential candidate.

The party went by the name "Adams Men" until after the disastrous defeat of their candidate, when the term "Anti-Jackson" alone remained. Searching for a name of more lasting significance, the party might have continued their hereditary name of "Federalist," but for the opprobrium attached to the term. It connoted the hated Alien and Sedition Acts of Federalist fame, the disgraceful Hartford Convention—a conspicuously

Its semi-opprobrious connotation

Federalist fiasco; and most of all, "Federalism" was associated with pro-British sympathy which the second war of independence had discountenanced. Thus, at a time when Anti-British sentiment was still rampant, the name "Federalist" was bound to bear an unhappy connotation. Popular prejudice, then, forbade the use of the name. It was an unpopular term for the additional reason that the Federalists as a party had failed; as an organized entity they had ceased to exist.

Those who opposed Jackson and adhered to Federalist principles groped about for a new name by which to give to their cause recognized existence. The other party, the Democratic Republican,[1] exercising a complete monopoly over eternally popular American political names, rendered the cause of the regenerated party hopeless. In their search for a fitting name, the Adams men referred to their organization as "The Peoples' Party"—a term which the Jackson men assailed as an inappropriate designation for their opponents who were only making "an attempt to revive the reign of the Adams family," which displayed "aristocratic tendencies," being "high toned" and "genteel." Democrats in Pittsburg scathingly referred to the Adams Party as composed of the wealthy and would be nobility of the city.[2] Finding it impossible to gain acceptance for the term, "People's Party," the Adams Men found comfort in an older and more tried term. They generally referred to themselves as "National Republicans."

The effort to establish a more popular name

To discover a party name is not difficult. The problem is to win for it general acceptance from the enemy. The Democrats were slow to honour the name National Republican. They in-

[1] Mc Kee—National Conventions and Platforms, pp. 16-24. The name —Democratic Republican, was just at this time more frequently used than either "Democratic" or "Republican," to designate the party which supported Jackson.

[2] The Pennsylvania Intelligencer—December 18, 1828; The Norristown Herald—July 2, 1828; The Harrisburg Argus—January 12, 1828.

sisted that only the hated term Federalist fitted the Adams Party. In fruitless endeavor to offset the effect of such slander, the National Republicans (for as such we will refer to them) returned the insult, charging the Democratic Party with being the real and original Federalists: "The Jackson Party are really Federalists, not the Adams Party. They know that the name Federalist is odious to the People, consequently they have discarded their distinguished appellation, and endeavor to ride into power on the shoulders of Democracy." Moreover, "the most consistent Democratic Republicans in the United States are the members of the Hartford Convention who are now also warm supporters of the election of Jackson." "The most violent Federalist and Federal newspapers in Pennsylvania and in the United States are among the most ardent advocates of the election of Jackson." [3]

The National Republican Party

It remained a part of Administration propaganda to force the disuse of the name Federalist by applying the term to the Jackson Party. It was pointed out that the Pro-British feeling associated with the term Federalist, belonged rather to the Jackson Party, it was claimed that British influence had been brought to bear in the Democratic ranks. Not venturing to associate Jackson with Pro-British leanings, the Administration Party attributed to him the support of British influence. They claimed to regret that "the cause of General Jackson is now advocated upon such principles as we had hoped were banished forever from the United States. It is gravely stated in the Jackson presses, that the 'London Courier' has magnanimously come out for General Jackson as President of the United States. All the British agents and their defendants were active and liberal in their support of the 'Jackson Ticket' in New York." Administration papers ascribed English support for Jackson to English

[3] The Pennsylvania Intelligencer, December 18, 1828; The Norristown Herald, July 2, 1828; The Harrisburg Argus, January 12, 1828.

interest in the low tariff policy of the Democrats, especially those of the Southern wing. In the language of the day: "The foreigners and English agents in New York boast that if money can carry the election in favor of Jackson it shall not be wanting. The British agents residing in our great commercial cities are determined to aid the projects of Jackson's party, because they favor directly the interests of Great Britain." [4]

The campaign of 1828

The nature of the projects of Jackson's party and the comparatively small part that political issues played in the campaign of 1828 will be reserved for treatment in subsequent chapters. The policies of the Democratic Republican party were at the most negative. They had outlined no definite plans of constructive legislation. Unlike the National Republicans, they were led by considerations not of principle but of subserviency to party dictatorship. The dominant note in the campaign literature of the time was the personal popularity of "the Hero of New Orleans." The praise of the Chief was sung to the suppression of all matters of political import. The Democrats relied for success solely upon the popularity of their military candidate. Their campaign propaganda was to the effect that the first soldier of the land should receive the highest honor in the gift of the people. The Democrats had the greatest confidence in their success. Jackson dinners given at Harrisburg in the early days of 1827 "looked well for the General." A politician from Lancaster wrote in this reassuring manner: "The people love and admire General Jackson and will give him their support in spite of their political leaders." The Democrats were sure that their hero was "in the hearts of the people." His victory in the state was of the utmost importance, for a "doubt about Pennsylvania," writes a Democrat at Harrisburg, "would seriously

Democratic Republican policy

[4] Bucks County Intelligencer, November 26, 1827; The Harrisburg Argus, May 10, 1828; Mss.—Buchanan, January 12, 1827, from Reynolds.

harm us in other states." The Democratic sage of Lancaster, James Buchanan, who boasted that he was making great exertions in Jackson's behalf, shared the same fear; he expresses the hope, "that nothing may occur to mar Jackson's prospects here, as a doubt about the vote of the state might have a serious effect against him throughout the Union." Democratic meetings were scheduled in all parts of the state to be held early in the spring. The candidacy of the military idol was promoted by several papers throughout the western counties. One editor writes of how he and "three or four other prints were holding on to the Military Chieftain, and thus assuring the result of the election."[5]

Jackson and his party were associated with opposition to Protection and Internal Improvements. "To offset this impression," the Democrats in Fayette County toasted The Chief on July 4, (1827) as an advocate of these policies. One of his friends urged him to come out in favor of Protection, "for," said he, "a declaration in favour coming from you at this time will be the most powerful argument that could be used in your favour." A corresponding declaration on the subject of Internal Improvement was not felt necessary as "it would have little effect one way or the other." Buchanan, himself, admitted that Democratic prospects were at one time "clouded by the Woolen Bill." But he and Ingham "resisted it triumphantly at county meetings," and had subsequently "been attacked in the Administration Papers."[6] While the Democrats were kept busy attacking Administration measures, another matter tended to "cloud their prospects" for success. This was the famous Corrupt Bargain Charge. Jackson's friends in Pennsylvania re-

Partisan attitude toward leading issues

[5] Mss.—Buchanan, 1827—February 23, from Thomas Elder, Harrisburg; July 11, to Duff Green; January 14, from G. R. Porter; February 1, February 27, from H. Hamliton, Harrisburg; January 14, to Porter; July 1, to Duff Green, Lancaster.

[6] Mss.—Jackson—December 28, 1827, from Steel of Fayette County; Mss.—Buchanan—August 10, 1827, January 4, 1828, to John H. Eaton.

gretted the charge, because it was "not susceptible to proof," and hoped that "it would work the General no harm." [7]

Early in the fall, Hugh Hamilton, a Democratic leader at Harrisburg, confidently sums up the situation: "In Union County, the Adams men cannot poll more than fifty votes at the outside; in Centre County four-fifths are for Jackson; in Huntingdon, there will be two to one for Jackson; in Mifflin a much more considerable majority. The Jackson Democrats of this (Dauphin) County say that they have matters so arranged in the townships as to carry their delegates throughout; in Cumberland County there has been an Adams meeting; hand bills and circulars were afloat several days previous; Adams may get three hundred in Cumberland; in Perry not fifty." Before the close of the year (1827), the Democrats had held county meetings and elected delegates for a convention which was held at Harrisburg on January the eighth. This meeting comprised more than one hundred and thirty-two delegates. [8]

Democratic situation in several counties

Democratic organization

The Democrats relied for success not only upon the personal popularity of their military candidate, but more especially upon their party organization. The hand of Van Buren, the political manipulator of New York, was early recognized in the management of the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania. He may have aimed to "twirl Pennsylvania about by his maneuvers as he had a goodly number of the New Yorkers." In any case, the Democratic Party in the state was becoming more efficiently organized, and more thoroughly centralized; the spoils system was already in vogue, the party lash was used with effect. Party alignments were made clear cut and definite. An Administration organ at Harrisburg complained: "At the commencement of this

[7] McMaster V—page 78; Mss.—Buchanan, August 20, 1827, from Edwards of Chester.

[8] Mss.—Buchanan, September 1, 1827, from Hugh Hamilton; Mss.—Jackson, December 4, 1857, from Steele; United States Gazette, January 14, 1828.

legislature, the Jacksonites began their work. Every officer of the legislature who was not, or who did not, declare himself a Jacksonite has been dismissed."[9]

Administration propaganda

It was the province of the Administration leaders to oppose Jackson on the very grounds on which he won support—his prestige as a military hero. The election of Jackson, it was feared, would establish the "dangerous precedent of rewarding military services alone with the highest civil honors. All history pointed out this precedent as a beacon to warn America of impending danger." National Republicans refused "to submit to military rule," and declared that at the legislature at Harrisburg, the "first adopted rule of action was to stop thinking in order that all things may be done in a military style." With deep foreboding, National Republican editors warned their readers that "in almost all cases where the civil authority has been entrusted to military chieftains it has eventually resulted in the downfall of the liberties of that nation."[10] The Democrats in turn continued to eulogize their military Idol and "made a bold attempt to identify his character and standing with that of Washington." They even insisted that a military hero made an ideal executive, for "in case of foreign war, he could take command of the army in person." The National Republicans, answering in the language of the time, asked: "Should we rather that Jackson were president and die all slaves, than that Adams were president and live all freemen? Remember Julius Caesar, Oliver Cromwell, Napoleon Bonaparte, and be wise. Can we expect to escape the fate of these Governments by pursuing their footsteps—Rome was not enslaved in one day. Caesar and Napoleon both pretended they were the best friends of their countries as General Jackson does. What have we not to expect from the

Opposition to the candidacy of a military hero

[9] Harrisburg Argus, December 15, 1827; April 12, 1828.

[10] United States Gazette, June 6, 1828; Norristown Herald, October 1, 1828.

election of Jackson? Why submit to military rule?'' In other and more dignified language, an Anti-Jackson leader addressed a town meeting in Philadelphia; he urged that Jackson, being a military man, could not represent us, a non-military people. Moreover, he considered that ''the duties of a president are all civil; military qualifications are not necessary, and military qualifications are all that Jackson has to offer.'' Further, it was feared that ''a military president would increase and strengthen the army instead of the navy—our safest, cheapest, and most efficient arm of national defense.'' Other Adams men claimed to fear that the election of the General as president would ''involve our country in War.'' His ''arbitrary and despotic disposition,'' his ''strong passions'' and ''ungovernable temper'' were subjects of concern. He was thought unfitted for official duties, being ''by nature and by education a mere soldier.'' But ''the Hero of two wars and forty frays'' continued to hold his own in the hearts of the people.[11]

Democrats laud Jackson as a man of the people

The Democrats lauded him not only as a military hero but also as the man of the people. He was a self-made man of the pioneer type from the young and growing West. In contrast, Adams was aristocratic and educated. ''He never could have been a Republican in the true sense of the word, for he spent seven years in European Seminaries of learning, and several years at European Courts.'' These offences were all the more alarming since Washington had ''advised against sending young Americans to Europe for their education.''[12] It was the part of Administration propaganda to make much of Jackson's inability as a speaker and writer and to ridicule his ignorance ''of the theory and practice of spelling.'' Jackson's advocates, admitting all this, still believed that the ''General possessed just

[11] United States Gazette, July 11, September 6, 1828; Harrisburg Argus, May 31, 1828; Norristown Herald, July 24, 1828.

[12] Norristown Herald, July 2, 1828; Mss.—Jackson, April 16, 1828.

those faculties which qualify a man for active service both in the cabinet and in the field."

By Spring, the Jackson advocates were becoming more confident of victory; but their opponents "did not consider Pennsylvania hopeless as yet."[13]

Overtures to the Pennsylvania Germans

Each party made efforts to gain the vote of the Pennsylvania "German." Overtures of every sort were extended to win his support. A sort of premature embryo German propagandist writes—"There is an intenseness of feeling in the German character which touches the very heart. To an incredible extent of knowledge and enlightened learning, they unite an unostentatious simplicity and unassuming manners, which bespeak the sterling cast of their minds." To win the hearts of the "Germans," the National Republicans went so far as to credit the dignified Adams with ability to speak "Dutch," and the accusation remained undenied.[14] Administration prints were fond of a fantastic tale of two Pennsylvania Germans who visited Adams at The White House, and discovered to their unbounded joy that he could converse fluently in the strange dialect of their native state. Democratic efforts to win the German vote took a more practical turn. Jacksonian politicians realized that the Germans of the state could best be reached through the German press. Exertions were made to control German language dailies. In Chambersburg where three newspapers were printed, two were in English and one in German. Of the English papers, one was pro-Jackson and the other pro-Adams. The one German paper was in favor of the election of Adams. Therefore, the Administration supporters had the advantage. The effect of this, Democratic leaders sought to offset. They tried to find a "well qualified young German" to run a rival German sheet. "It was indispensable that he should be able to translate German into English

[13] United States Gazette, April 2, June 6, 1628.

[14] Harrisburg Argus, April 18, 1828; Norristown Herald, July 2, 1828.

and English into German." Types, press, and all the implements necessary for publishing a paper were procured. It was hoped that "there would surely be patronage enough to justify the undertaking at least until after the election for electors when the editor could judge whether it would be advisable to continue the paper." One Jacksonian wrote: "I hazard nothing in saying that the friends of Jackson would support the paper by subscribing in many instances when they could not read it." [15]

Fourth of July partisan celebrations

The approaching celebration of the national birthday led to great exertions on both sides. Party spirit divided the citizens in their commemorative festivities. The Jackson men avoided National Republican gatherings, fearing that "they would be under too much restraint in Genteel company." Between the friends of the rival parties, it was felt that there could not be "any community of feeling or principle." At the partisan festivals long political harangues were followed by toasts to honour party leaders, and to discredit leading opponents. A Jackson banquet at Harrisburg drank "to John Quincy Adams—a hypocrite and complete political weathercock" and to "the Jacksonites," that they might "soon shake off the yoke of John Quincy Adams and obtain that democracy for which they are so nobly contending." A favourite doggerel of the times was:

"May we next election day
With Hickory break the monument of Clay."

The cry of the opposition was:

"Ye Adams men stand firmly all
Around the live oak tree,
The Hickory totters to its fall."

[15] Mss.—Buchanan, June 26, 1828, from Thomas H. Crawford, Chambersburg.

In the several counties, the Jacksonian party held Harvest Homes and distributed pamphlets and handbills.[16]

The Jackson people had so well canvassed every county, and so accurately knew their strength and weakness in every locality, that in most instances they could predict the outcome of the coming election in individual counties. In the summer of 1828, the Democrats realized that they would lose Adams County which as results were later to show was one of the four counties that was won by Adams. Chester County was a cause of great solicitude. The Democrats feared they would lose it. Barnard[17] wrote: "My impression is that the majority in this county will be for the Adams ticket; but this the friends of General Jackson will not admit." Another prominent Democrat frankly wrote: "I sincerely think the Jackson ticket will fail in Chester County by many hundreds." Election returns showed that although the Democrats did not lose Chester County, they won it by a very slight majority; Delaware County they lost by 390 votes at the general elections, and by 211 at the election for electors. They accounted for their loss in this county by the fact that newspaper editors were not sufficiently ardent in their support of the military hero. The editor of the Upland Union was for a long time neutral and did not come out strongly for Jackson. By September the Democrats were able to report: "Jackson looks well; but it is feared by some that his enemies will report him dead just before the election to prevent the people from voting for him." As the day for voting approached, Jackson's prospects became brighter. From Western Pennsylvania, Van Buren heard—"Adams will not get a vote on this side of the mountain."[18]

Democratic expectations

[16] Harrisburg Chronicle, July 7, 1828, August 4, 1828; Norristown Herald, July 2, 1828.

[17] See Appendix C.

[18] Mss.—Buchanan, July 1, 1828, from Barnard, West Chester, 1828, from Joseph Sharp, London Grove; Pennsylvania Intelligencer, September 30, 1828; Mss.—Van Buren, September 27, 1828, from Lewis.

On October third, the elections were held for Congressmen, Assemblymen, Commissioners, Sheriffs. The election resulted in Democratic victory. The Jackson Assembly ticket in Harrisburg succeeded by more than 1000 majority. Lancaster city gave the Democratic candidate 1058 majority. On the same day, the elections took place in the several wards of Philadelphia. In the Northern Liberties, and in the other Districts, the Jackson ticket was elected. The Jackson candidate for Congress received a majority of 557 over Sergeant. In Montgomery County, the Jackson candidates were elected by a majority of 700. The Jackson majority in other counties was: York, 1050; Lebanon, 570; Dauphin, 700; Lancaster, 1400. In Allegheny County, the Jackson Assembly ticket succeeded by a small majority. The Adams men carried their candidate for commissioner, and the Jackson men their sheriff. On October twenty-first, the councils of Philadelphia met to choose a mayor. The Jackson candidate was successful. In their defeat, the National Republicans saw only the work of designing politicians. They felt that the state "no longer stood for principles, but for men." Though the general election had terminated against their wishes, they did not let such defeat retard their exertions for the election for electors on October thirty-first. They called upon the people of the state more rigorously than ever not to favor the Military Idol, to remember the downfall of the Roman Empire, the cruelty and despotism of military rulers and the danger of standing armies.[19]

The October elections

The Democrats anticipated "a great and honorable triumph." In Washington County where there were 5000 voters, they expected a majority of 2000 to 3000. They looked for a state majority of 50,000.[20] The electioneering was far from

[19] Norristown Herald, October 22, 1828, quoted from The Harrisburg Argus; United States Gazette, October 4, 15, 17, 21, 22, 1828.

[20] United States Gazette, October 31, 1628; Mss., Jackson, October 6, 1828, from Davis, Washington County, Pennsylvania.

dignified. It represented the beginning of that strong party spirit which animated the followers of Jackson and grew more intense as election day approached. The favourite symbol of Jacksonianism came to the fore. Large Hickory poles indicated the headquarters of the Jackson forces. Here politicians wel comed and entertained the rabble who indulged in "outrageous proceedings" in order to "intimidate" the Adams supporters.[21] Such proceedings led in later campaigns to violent party war and even to bloodshed.

Electioneering schemes

Meantime, the Administration politicians had organized committees of correspondence in the several counties which they directed from a central committee at Harrisburg. They continued to distribute throughout the state party literature in the nature of handbills and posters. Again they hurled at the Jackson Party the despised name—Federal. But the Demoerats had their revenge. Election morning (October 31) saw posted upon court house walls and other public buildings large handbills bearing the inscription: The Administration Party are the "Tories of '98," the "plotters of the Hartford Convention," and worst of all, "the authors of the alien, gag and sedition laws."[22] On October 31, the state of Pennsylvania chose its twenty-one electors for President and Vice-President. The returns from Philadelphia city showed a majority of about 3327 votes for Adams as against about 4381 votes for Jackson. Philadelphia County also went for Jackson. In Germantown, the Jackson ticket won in the Lower and Upper Ward and in Kensington. Adams had majorities in five of the fifty-two counties: Delaware, Bucks, Adams, Erie and Beaver. But all other counties gave majorities for Jackson. In the total vote of the state,

Adams carries only five counties

[21] Pennsylvania Intelligencer, October 7, 1828; Harrisburg Chronicle, October 27, 1828.

[22] Pennsylvania Intelligencer, October 14, 1828; Norristown Herald, November 19, 1828.

Jackson received 101,652 votes; Adams, 50,848, leaving a majority of 50,804 for Jackson. [23]

The Jacksonites celebrated their victory with great noise and excitement; in Pittsburgh, late at night, they assembled to burn tar barrels, a proceeding contrary to law. Police officials who attempted to arrest them were thrown down in the confusion The excitement reached its height when the court house was set on fire. The whole uproar was cited by the disappointed Adams men as a "pretty specimen of Jacksonianism." They shrank "from another political contest which would promise to be characterized by the fierceness which marked the Presidential election" of 1828. [24]

Jacksonite celebrations

In a neighboring state, the Jackson forces had to contend with a new political element—a sort of embryo third party which politicians had made use of to detract from the strength of Jackson. This strange new party grew into remarkable prominence under the name—Antimasonic. Organized opposition to Masonry grew out of intense popular excitement, directed against secret societies in general and especially against Free Masonry. For a time a consideration of secret societies obscured all other questions. The growth of the political furore was sudden and its intensity increased with its expansion into other localities until it assumed the proportions and dignity of a political party. No end of popular excitement is needed to ensure success for a young and growing third party. Prejudice against an established institution must be fanned and utilized to the fullest extent. Innocent and unoffending as Free Masonry appears in the political

The rise of a third party

[23] See Appendix A for the names of the three districts into which Philadelphia city and county were divided for representation in the state legislature and in Congress. United States Gazette, November 1, 1828; Philadelphia Daily Chronicle, November 1, 1828; Norristown Herald, November 12, 1828—the figures differ slightly in the several papers.

[24] United States Gazette, November 6, 1828; The Allegheny Democrat, May 19, 1829.

world of our day, in the late twenties the institution became the butt of abuses without end and protest without foundation. Opponents of Masonry began to organize themselves politically. In September, 1827, they held a convention in New York, and nominated a legislative ticket. During this and the following month, nominating conventions were held in western New York. Anti-masons succeeded in electing fifteen members of the assembly. To all intents, the Anti-masons were an independent party of one idea. Yet it must be added that even at the beginning of their career, they leaned to the side of the National Republicans rather then to the Democrats. As a party and as individuals they preferred Adams to Jackson. President Adams let it be known that he was not a Mason. He said: "I am not, never was and never shall be a Free-Mason." But it was well understood that Jackson was a Mason and gloried in the fact. In the Antimasonic convention of 1828 at Utica, Thurlow Weed insisted that a candidate be nominated acceptable to the Antimasons. His enemies accused him of utilizing the whole Antimasonic excitement for party reasons hoping through a National Republican-Antimasonic union to defeat the Jackson forces.

The partisan character of Anti-Masonry

Antimasonry grew rapidly in the region of its origin. Time and distance might tend to diminish the excitement. If the movement was to spread at all, the work of the propagandist must be speedy and effective. Already Weed had in publication Antimasonic papers which were acquiring an increased circulation. They were sent south into Pennsylvania where they were subscribed for in the counties of Allegheny, Somerset, Union, Lancaster and Chester, which were destined to become centres of Antimasonry. In 1832, Pennsylvania had fifty-five weekly Antimasonic papers. Thus, far from the scene of its origin, Antimasonry took root and held the imagination of its converts. The new thought could not have gained ground so readily if the soil had not been prepared for its acceptance. Antimasonry was a

product of the spirit of the times. Social unrest and political and economic agitation accompanied the revival of democratic ideas, which characterized the Jacksonian epoch. Protest was organized against old and established institutions which were thought to oppress the people. Free Masons as a class were looked upon "as members of an anti-democratic institution." Their forms and ceremonials became objects of attack. They were regarded as "anti-republican and an insidious and dangerous enemy to our democratic form of government;" and as creating and sustaining "secret orders of nobility." Secret societies in general were attacked as Antimasonic and as dangerous to the liberties of the state. By 1829, the new party was a force to cope with in Pennsylvania. The National Republicans hoped to win them to their ranks and began a series of overtures, which they never relinquished. The story of the amalgamation of the two parties will be reserved for a subsequent chapter. McCarthy has it that the party (Antimasonic) "furnished the first solid basis for the Whig movement of the future."[25] This honour would seem more properly to belong to the National Republicans, who had a state and national organization before the Antimasonic party entered the political arena. Moreover, the National Republicans had definite Whig doctrines, whereas the Antimasons were still in bondage to one idea. The National Republican Party rather than the Antimasonic Party was the nucleus about which the Whig Party developed through amalgamation with all Anti-Jackson-Anti-Van Buren forces.

The Antimasons lean toward the National Republicans

Thus in 1829, there were three parties in Pennsylvania: the Democrats, whose hopes had been accelerated by the presidential victory, the Antimasons and the National Republicans. The last two informally coalesced or at least united in their choice of a

The gubernatorial campaign of 1829

[25] Mss., Van Buren, November 16, 1828, to Jackson; Thurlow Weed, Autobiography, 309-310; 318-319; De Alva S. Alexander, A Political History of the State of New York, Vol. I, 360-361; McCarthy, in passim.

candidate for governor. Both nominated Joseph Ritner, fated to become the proverbial Antimasonic candidate. He won their hearts through having "refused many overtures to become a Mason." He had served for six years in the Lower House and had been twice elected Speaker. Despite such a record, he was "heralded all over the state as an utter ignoramus." It was true that he had had little opportunity for education having been born and reared on a farm in Berks County. His ancestors had emigrated from Germany about a century before. He read his *native* language well at an early age, but his "progress in English was for a while retarded by the prejudices which existed at that day in the minds of many respectable Germans against an English education." [26] Democratic prints insisted he could understand only German. A coalition paper conceded he "is a German but speaks the English language well." According to one who knew him, "he learned to speak the English language as near perfectly as possible for one who had not the advantage of a collegiate education, but the German accent was plainly visible."

The coalition candidate, Joseph Ritner

As events will show, the Democrats also nominated a "German" candidate, George Wolf, who had been a member of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania [1814-1815], and had been elected to Congress for several consecutive terms. [27] Pennsylvania was at this period enjoying a succession of "German" Governors. Shulze, then Governor, had been preceded by Joseph Hiester and was destined to be succeeded by Wolf, who was followed by Ritner. [28] Many Democratic politicians feared it would

The Democratic candidate, George Wolf

[26] Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, January 20, 7, 1829; Norristown Herald, February 18, 1859; American Daily Advertiser, February 10, 1829; United States Gazette, February 9, 1829.

[27] The Statesman, August 10, 1831; McClure, 1, page 30; Pennsylvania Intelligencer, April 9, 1829; Harrisburg Chronicle, March 9, 1829.

[28] For a list of Pennsylvania Governors with the dates of their terms of office see Appendix B.

not be the part of good policy to urge the nomination of another German. One political manipulator opposes the candidacy of Wolf even though he "is better qualified than Shulze and is one of the most amiable men I ever knew," for, "as our last two governors are Germans, I, as one of the same family, think we ought not to insist on another;" he suggested McKean [29] as the proper candidate.

The re-nomination of Governor Shulze did not meet with universal approval, because his stand on national politics was not sufficiently definite. Democrats favored him as long as he stood firm for Jackson, but he failed to become their candidate, for he did not succeed in keeping "clear of the flattery of the coalition," whereas Wolf was willing to "stand or fall with the Jackson Party."

National politics and state politics went hand in hand. Democratic political tactics were directed from Washington. The state had been instrumental in making Jackson, it now awaited its reward in political preferment. A seat in the cabinet for a Pennsylvanian was the least to be expected. It seemed "to be admitted that Pennsylvania is to have whatever department she chooses in the new cabinet" came the exultant news from Washington. All were sure that Pennsylvania would "be represented in the cabinet as she ought to be." [30] In the early days of 1829, every cabinet post had been hoped for by the state. It was suggested that General Cadwallader of Philadelphia be made Secretary of War. The Treasury portfolio, Van Buren was advised, should be reserved for Pennsylvania and Ingham.

The Democratic organization, a unifying force in nation and state

The practice of political reward and punishment extended to all branches of the Democratic service. At party meetings held in the several counties, delegates for the coming guberna-

[29] See Appendix C.

[30] Harrisburg Argus, May 10, 1828; Allegheny Democrat, June 23, 1829; Mss., Coryell, December 10, 1828, from Miller, Washington.

torial convention were instructed to "support no one who is not a decided friend to Jackson." Wolf had the wisdom to affiliate himself unmistakedly with the Jacksonian interests. This the party leaders at Washington realized, and sent their agents to the state to promote his nomination as governor.

The Democratic nomination convention was scheduled to meet, according to custom, at Harrisburg, on the fourth day of March—a time-honored date for such convention. None but the political manipulators could foretell the results of the meeting; many candidates were in the field. Compromises would have to be effected and alliances achieved. There was no universal unanimity for any one candidate, though many had a strong, strictly local following. For example, in Doylestown, it was supposed that the people "to a man were loud for McKean." [31] Lycoming and Lucern counties also favored his candidacy. In Chester county, Barnard was particularly strong. In Bedford county Shulze was favored, though he was not popular elsewhere. His chances for re-nomination on March 4 were generally regarded as "extremely doubtful, if not impossible." [32] In a day of slow communication it was difficult to ascertain the political temperament of the entire state. Often farmers did not assemble to elect delegates because their newspapers so advising had been delayed in reaching them. In the western parts of the state, the notice for delegate meetings and county conventions was not published soon enough; only four or five days were allowed for the circulation of a notice intended for the whole county. Most of the farmers did not get their papers in less than a week or two weeks. Politicians sent their scouts about the country to glean

Local favorites

[31] Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, January 1, 1829; Mss., Van-Buren, February 19, 1829, from J. Hamilton; Harrisburg Argus, January 31, 1859; McClure, 1, page 25; Mss., Shulze, May 21, 1829, to Wolf from Shaw, Doylestown.

[32] Norristown Herald, February 4, 1829; Harrisburg Argus, January 31, 1829; Mss., Shulze, January 16, 1829, Hobart to Buehler, Reading.

what news they might from public gatherings. Wolf heard from one of his informants: "We often met in the evenings at one tavern or other promiscuously each speaking his sentiments of the candidates and of their respective chances of success: some were for Barnard, some for Shulze." [33]

Before the end of February, the several counties had held conventions in which the representatives from the districts in the counties had elected delegates for the March convention. Accordingly at the set time and place one hundred and thirty-two delegates assembled. This convention as many other conventions in Pennsylvania was destined not to be harmonious. The customary disputes over the eligibility of certain delegates arose to mar the legality of the proceedings. The question this time concerned the delegation from Chester County. In this county, a division among the friends of Jackson had taken place.

The nominating convention

Two sets of delegates were sent to Harrisburg; the first were excluded and replaced by a "spurious delegation." The first supported the nomination of General Barnard who was regarded as a good compromise candidate, "around whom the party would rally." He was "conceded by all" to be "the most popular man in the state." He was an unwavering Democrat, and therefore a most desirable candidate. Had the first delegation from Chester County been admitted, their undoubted support of Barnard might have served to defeat Wolf. The fact was, however, that the secondly appointed delegates were admitted by a vote (in the convention) of 71-56. Fifteen ballots for governor were taken. After the first ballot McKean headed the list with twenty-five votes. The next day six ineffectual ballots were taken, McKean and Barnard heading the list in turn. Finally, on the third day (Friday, March 6), a compromise was effected, possibly through the ingenuity of a party worker from head-

The Chester County delegation

[33] Allegheny Democrat, June 16, 1829; Mss., Shulze, May 21, 1829.

quarters, Dr. Joel B. Sutherland, a United States congressman from Pennsylvania. A National Republican periodical thus relates his influence over the convention: "Sutherland come down to Harrisburg from Washington. His presence was regarded of great moment to the interests of the junto at Washington who are anxious to rule the state and dictate for Pennsylvania. On the fourth and fifth, Sutherland laboured for his employers. Finding it was impossible to force M'Kean upon the convention, and being unwilling to let the nomination fall to Barnard, the nod was given, and the whole family interest went to Wolf. Sutherland then effected a breach among the friends of Stevenson, one of the candidates." A compromise was reached between the friends of Wolf and Sutherland, by virtue of which Wolf was said to have won the nomination. In any case, at the eleventh ballot, Wolf had only nineteen votes, by the twelfth he had twenty-four votes, and at the thirteenth ballot taken on the third day, he received fifty-seven votes. Barnard still headed the list until with the fifteenth ballot, Wolf had seventy votes, and Barnard sixty-two. Wolf was then declared the Democratic candidate of Pennsylvania. His disputed nomination was a subject of bitter partisan strife. A Harrisburg paper declared—"He received but twelve votes in convention until his election was concerted by Masonic intrigue through the management of Sutherland."[34]

Wolf's disputed nomination

Anti-Wolf papers were loud in denouncing the result: "It is obvious that Wolf was not the choice of the delegates, and that his nomination was effected only because they could not succeed in nominating any other person. If the votes of the rejected delegates from Chester County had been received, Barnard would have been nominated." Rejection of the delegates was said to be "so palpably unjust that that act of the convention is regarded by thousands as having vitiated all they did after-

[34] Harrisburg Chronicle, March 9, 1829; Norristown Herald, February 4, April 1, 11, March 25, 1829; The Republican, October 9, 1829.

wards.'' In Chester County the whole convention was denounced and indignation meetings were held. On March 9, a meeting in West Chester resolved to hold another county meeting ''to decide whether they were represented or misrepresented in the Harrisburg Convention.'' This meeting was held at Downingtown on the twenty-sixth. It represented ''a rising of the sovereign people to assert their rights and redress their wrongs.....The Fathers of our Democracy were there—a number of them enfeebled in their limbs by length of years and exposure in the tented field during the Revolutionary conflict, but as firm as ever in defence of their principles and honour. Their sons were there, nurtured in the principles of the fathers and now determined to wipe away the foul stain which a faction has attempted to fix upon the character of Chester County.'' The meeting condemned the votes of the delegates from their county in Harrisburg in resolutions which declared that ''the legitimate representatives of the Democratic-Republicans of Chester County were most unjustly excluded from their seats, and a spurious delegation admitted in their stead in violation of our rights as a constituent portion of the Democracy of the Commonwealth.'' Secondly, ''The spurious delegates grossly mis-represented the known will of the Democratic Party of Chester County.'' The third resolution declared it ''the duty of freemen to assert their rights whenever they may be violated by intrigue or fraudulent combinations.'' As a final resolution, the meeting submitted ''the expediency of another convention to be held at Harrisburg on May 28, 1829.'' [35]

Indignation meeting in Chester County

The defeated faction took comfort in the fact that ''another and a growing party in Pennsylvania have already given unequivocal evidence of their determination to oppose Wolf.'' The allusion was to the Antimasonic associations,'' which were thick

[35] Norristown Herald, March 18, 1829; April 1, 1829; Harrisburg Chronicle, March 30, 1829.

Anti-masonic opposition to Wolf

and widespread in Chester County." After the Antimasonic convention of June 25, when Ritner was nominated, Antimasonic papers came out strongly against Wolf as a Mason and a leader of Masons. They denied that "The Masonic Party in Pennsylvania were distinguished by the appellation of "The Wolf Party," for "the Sheep of the state should be cautious how they choose a *Wolf* for their Shepherd." Much as the Antimasons praised Ritner, and denounced Wolf, they at the same time realized that "The election of Joseph Ritner would not alone effect the destruction of Masonry. Its ascendency in the state legislature must also be prevented. The Masonic oath to assist a brother Mason is calculated to operate against the due administration of the laws." The Anti-Masons followed the example of the other parties in having committees of Safety and of Correspondence in various counties. They also held meetings "relative to the ensuing election." At Dauphin County and elsewhere, Anti-Masonic meetings expressed the sentiment: "That Masonry has had a political bearing throughout the country we think must be evident to all, when it is considered that a large majority of our public officers of almost every grade and description are members of that institution."

The election of Wolf

In spite of the opposition of two parties, Wolf was successful in the October election. Ritner was defeated by about 16,000 majority.[36] Ritner's heaviest vote was in the southern and western parts of the state, though he lost both the city and county of Philadelphia. In the city, Wolf had 4059 votes as against 333 for Ritner. In the county, Wolf's votes numbered 7043; those of Ritner, 223. In Philadelphia city, a Workingmen's Ticket polled a few votes, but did not elect anyone. There are indications that this election was not conducted more orderly than was usual in the case of Pennsylvania elections. The Anti-

[36] In the next gubernatorial election, this number was reduced to about 3000, and in 1835 Ritner was elected by a plurality of nearly 30,000.

Masonic Herald tells us that the polls in Lancaster city were "surrounded by the craft at an early hour. Desperadoes had orders from the lodge to arrest every Anti-Masonic voter."

On the whole the Antimasons had played a far larger part in the campaign than the Democrats had anticipated. The papers on the side of Wolf acknowledged that the "Antimasonic opposition to him has been much more formidable than was expected." Friends congratulated Wolf on "the success of his election over the most unnatural opposition and excitement that ever pervaded this state." From Doylestown he heard "of the strange and unexpected Anti-Masonic opposition," which "seemed a disease that infected all parties alike."[37] Buchanan writes from Lancaster: Anti-Masonry has overwhelmed us like a tornado in this county; until within a few days of the election none of us had an idea of its extension in influence over the minds of our people. Adams men with the exception of a few masons and their immediate relatives were unanimous in their opposition to our ticket and their numbers were swelled by the addition of many honest Jackson men who have been seduced into the belief that Masonry is a dangerous and unprincipled institution. No doubt, "the friends of Adams created division in the Jackson Party by denouncing Masonry," and especially by denouncing Wolf, who "in early life joined the institution of Masonry." Buchanan was said to have spoken at Lancaster "in favour of his Right Worshipful Brother, District Deputy Grand Master George Wolf." The excitement against Masonry was indeed considerable.[38] The Antimasons had high hope for the future.

Growing importance of the Anti-masonic Party

[37] Anti-Masonic Herald, June 12, August 13, October 16, 1829; Harrisburg Chronicle, July 13, August 31, 1829; Pennsylvania Intelligencer, August 11, September 15, 1829; National Gazette, September 29, 1829; American Daily Advertiser, October 17, 1829; Mss., Wolf (at Harrisburg), November 4, 1829, Chester, Pennsylvania; Mss., Wolf, October 30, 1829, from Shaw, Doylestown.

[38] Mss., Buchanan, October 15, 1829, to Wolf, Lancaster; Harrisburg

From the Blairsville Record we read—"Anti-Masonry is the lever, and will, if sueeessful, become the fulcrum by which soeiety is to be moved from its foundations." The presses engaged in the Antimasonic cause now amounted to about one hundred and twenty and were continuing to increase throughout the state. How far the political "disease" would have power to extend, it was not easy to say. It was certainly spreading far and wide. From Chester County came the exultant prediction—"Before the next election it (Anti-Masonry) will put down all opposition. The Demoeratic Party will be compelled to yield to superior numbers." Buchanan said, "There are now but two parties, out of Philadelphia, the Demoeratic and the Antimasonic, or Adams Party. The Federal Party is everywhere broken up." The Antimasons themselves, however, were not so willing as their enemies to identify their cause with the Anti-Jaekson forees. The more radical of them felt: "The question is now no longer Federal or Democrat for Federalism has ceased to exist. It is no longer Jaekson or Adams, for the former has obtained all that his warmest friends desired. It is now Mason and Antimason."[39] Opposition to established institutions characterized the period—isms and antis flourished. The country threatened "to be split up." "Antimasons, Anti-Republican and Anti-everything" promised "considerable confusion." Antimasonry was especially strong in the western eounties and in the counties of Chester, Delaware, and Lancaster. George Buchanan writes from Pittsburg: "Antimasonry is still flourishing. No western county will return a Mason to the next legislature. The honest Antimasons, the old Adams men and the disappointed offieeseek-

Antimasonic ambitions

Chronicle, September 28, 1829; October 25, 1829; Anti-Masonic Herald, October 16, 1829; Mss., Wolf, November 8, 1829, Harrisburg.

[39] Harrisburg Chronicle, April 4, December 8, 1830; November 16, 1829; Mss., Wolf, October 30, 1829; Mss., Buchanan, October 15, 1829, to Wolf; The Republican and Anti-Masonic Inquirer, October 31, 1829.

ers are easily induced to unite their influence against the 'powers that be.' The motely materials are thus thrown into one cauldron and stirred up into a dangerous compound." In Lancaster, a Democratic newspaper failed because great numbers of Antimasons formerly subscribers withdrew their patronage.[40] Lancaster early became an Antimasonic stronghold. This fact was due largely to the influence of its renowned citizen, Thaddeus Stevens, who threw himself heart and soul into the erratic cause. In this he was encouraged by his father who writes to him at this time: "My son, we hear that you are engaged in the Anti-Masonick cause, I think it to be a good cause, but a dangerous won, because it creates enemies. the Lord has I trust begun to cause Satin's kingdom to fall to the ground." Thad Stevens was no doubt a sincere Anti-Mason who felt his cause to be "the cause of reason and principle—the great cause of republicanism and the people." Although the Antimasonic fever did not "rage generally throughout the country," it "evidently was contagious," for "the Quakers, Menists and some of the German townships became Anti-Masoned."[41] The movement met favour with the plain living farmers of the community as a sort of holy crusade against worldly corruption, as "the cause of light against darkness, of candor against deceit."

Anti-masonry in Lancaster County

Yet it was the charge of their enemies that Antimasons were "exclusively occupied with dreams of office," and uninterested in "public measures in which the prosperity of the country, and the happiness and comfort of the people depend."[42] The term "political Anti-Masonry" was the favourite taunt of the jealous Jacksonians who realized only too well that po-

[40] Mss., Coryell, May 11, 1830, from Eldred, Bethany; Mss., Buchanan, May 4, 1830, from George Buchanan, Pittsburg.

[41] Stevens Papers, in Mss., at Washington, April 27, 1830; Anti-Masonic Herald, February 26, 1830; Mss., Wolf, May 1, 1830, from Captain D. Wagener (this letter is at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

Democratic jealousy of Anti-masonic gains

litical Anti-Masonry was in "open array against the Democratic party." In despair, they revived the worn out charge of "Federalist." They accused the Anti-Masons of degrading themselves "to ride old Federalists and Hartford Conventionists into office." In Anti-Masonic county meetings and larger conventions the Jackson Party recognized only "Federalists of the old ultra, uncompromising stamp, or broken-down, worn out and disappointed Democrats."[43] Just as the National Republicans before them, the Anti-Masons denied the disgraceful term, Federalist, and retorted by hurling back at the enemy the antique charge. They derided the Democrats as a party of many names; they identified them with the Masons, declaring that the Masonic Party had assumed the title Democratic Republican, and had changed "their political coats to suit all times." "At one time they are high toned Federalists and anon they are Democratic Republicans. Weathercock men belonging to an order of titled aristocracy, whose rulers are styled Grand Kings, Princes, Nobles and Illustrious Knights; among these wool-dyed Democrats are James Buchanan, who is still a Federalist to the backbone."[44] "Our leading Democrats are Jacobins—enemies to all government." At the same time, the Antimasons boasted of their political independence. They disclaimed any permanent political union with another party. "Regardless of all false assertions, the Antimasons are a consistent and an independent party; they are opposed to Masonry and they form no union with their enemies."[45] In justice to the cause, it must be added that at

[42] The Statesman, July 6, 1831; Harrisburg Chronicle, August 30, 1830.

[43] Harrisburg Chronicle, September 13, 1830; Harrisburg Reporter, March 26, 1830.

[44] Buchanan had been a Federalist quite early in his political career.

[45] The Antimasonic party was supposed to have united with Clay and then with Jackson. A small faction of the party joined their cause with the Jackson party and placed in the field Democratic-Antimasonic candidates; one of these was C. A. Barnetz of York County. Mss., Buchanan, from Reynolds, Lancaster, August 15, 1832.

this period, at least, the Antimasons were comparatively independent. They held their own county meetings and even elected delegates for a state convention of their own which was to meet at Harrisburg on February the 25., 1830.[46] The object of the convention was to appoint delegates for a subsequent national convention, which met in Philadelphia in the following spring. This convention is commonly, though, as some claim, erroneously, referred to as the first political national convention held in this country. Francis Granger of New York acted as president and Ritner as vice-president. The nomination of a presidential candidate was postponed. The convention adjourned to meet again a year later at Baltimore. The Pennsylvania delegates for this convention were elected at an Antimasonic state convention held at Harrisburg on May 25, 1831, the delegates for which had been chosen at Antimasonic county meetings.[47] The Baltimore convention nominated William Wirt of Maryland for president and Amos Ellmaker of Pennsylvania for vice-president. The convention adopted no platform. In their campaign for president as well as for governor, the Antimasons remained true to the basic principles of their organization; they denounced Masonry. They declared that the Masonic institution had been used for political purposes, that no man could hold an office under the government unless he worshipped at the shrine of Masonry. They proclaimed: "There is nothing in the nature of our government which requires the aid of secret societies. This state is bowed down to the dust by the power of a secret combination. It is absurd to suppose that nearly all the high offices of our state are filled by chance with Free Masons; the Governor, and the Secretary of Pennsylvania, the Attorney General and the Audi-

Antimasonic Independence

[46] The Statesman, August 17, 1831; Anti-Masonic Herald, March 5, 1830.

[47] Harrisburg Chronicle, September 20, 1830; The Statesman, April 9, 1831, May 11, 1831; Pennsylvania Intelligencer, December 19, 1831.

tor General are all Free Masons. Through this channel nearly all the offices of the state are filled.'' Ritner, being the candidate of the party, was praised and Wolf generally denounced. The Governor's annual message was condemned as ''Wolf's long howl''—as a ''generalisation of general prosperity and blessing, general health, general wealth, general peace and general absurdity.'' [48]

Democratic exertions

Meanwhile, the Democrats felt it ''necessary to shape the Democratic course at once for the campaign of 1832,'' for ''if the friends of Jackson lose their General in Pennsylvania at that time, they may also lose their President and every honorable means ought now to be used to avert so great a misfortune.'' [49] One means employed to avert a Jacksonian defeat was the attempt to buy up newspapers throughout the state. In Bucks County, the Democrats labored to persuade *The Argus* and *The Whig* to unite in support of Wolf. *The Whig* editor was willing to sell out; but ''did not relish a union.'' For the trifling sum of $400, the *Argus* editor yielded, and his paper came out a week later ''under the new title for Jackson and Wolf.'' The editorial part of the paper was to be under Democratic management, and to support Jackson and Wolf. It was thought the ''purchase'' would have a ''powerful effect'' not only in Bucks County, but throughout the state. [50] The following year, a new Jackson sheet, ''The American Manufacturer,'' was established at Pittsburg by William B. Conway. In the next presidential campaign, the bribery of the press was one of the charges preferred

[48] Mc Kee, National Conventions and Platforms, pages 30-31; The Statesman, May 11, 1831, September 14, 1831; Pennsylvania Telegraph, December 19, 1831.

[49] Mss., Van Buren, William Davidson and C. A. Norton to Gibson, Connellsville, Fayette County, Pennsylvania, November 3, 1829.

[50] Mss., Wolf, May 27, 1830, from Wagener, Easton (at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania); Mss., Wolf, May 31, 1830, from Maguire, Hess and others, Easton, Pennsylvania (at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

against Jackson. "The public press," said the National Republicans in convention, "once the palladium of our liberties, has as far as the means of the exeeutive would allow, been brought up, and rendered a mere instrument to answer his purposes. Editors, almost unnumerable, have been rewarded, or purchased with the highest offices in his gift, and hundreds of pensioned presses scattered throughout the land stand ever ready to do his bidding." James Buehanan, as a server of Jaeksonian interests, discovered the political preferences of all the papers in the eastern part of the state. Editors were interviewed and their politieal standing aseertained or seeured. Some proved to be "timid ereatures," and others eame out boldly in favor of the Jaeksonian party.

Through the zeal of his brother, George, an untiring party worker, and faithful eorrespondent, Buehanan learned the politieal temper of several localities. George Buehanan seems to have been in elosc touch with Governor Wolf. He found the Governor congenial enough, but writes: "His daughter pleased my faney more than the old gentleman himself. She is a very interesting lady, and has well nigh stolen my heart." In June, we find Brother George aeeompanying Wolf in an electioneering tour of the surrounding country—the political value of such travel being realized even at that early day. In the eourse of their trip they lingered at the "ideal" community, established at Eeonomy in Beaver County. George Buchanan writes: Wolf was exceedingly well reeeived by the people of that singular village. His plain manners and German language endeared him very mueh to Rapp and his whole society. [51]

Wolf's electioneering tour, June, 1831

The objeet of the electioneering tour had been to promote the prospeets of the Demoeratic party by maintaining harmony

[51] Mss., Jackson, March 31, 1831; Pamphlet of the National Republican Convention, 1832; Mss., Buchanan, June 15, 1831; March 23, 1831, from George Buchanan, Pittsburg.

in its ranks, for already seeds of discord had been sown. Traces appeared of a decentralizing tendency, which became only too evident four years later, and cost the party the governorship of the state. Occurrences indicated that not all the Democrats of the state were loyal to the Chief at Washington. The discord was due to the machinations of Sutherland and Ingham, in whom Jackson recognized agents of Calhoun.[52] The division in the Democratic ranks was a reflection of the rupture between Calhoun and Jackson. Since 1824, Calhoun had cherished the hope of controlling Pennsylvania. Among those who were accused of promoting his interests in the state may be cited: Ingham, of the Treasury, Branch, of the Navy, Berrien, Attorney-General, and most conspicuously, Sutherland, whom we have met before in the character of a sort of ex-officio leader, or, less euphoniously, a Democratic boss of the state. Petrikin, formerly a state senator from Centre County and at this time a representative at Harrisburg, boldly details the situation to Jackson: "Ingham and his friends, noted for their intrigues throughout the state, want to get you out of the way, and support John C. Calhoun. They are at work in a covert way to destroy you in the affections of the people. Sutherland called meetings only to answer selfish ends. Your friends are surprised that you retain in your cabinet a man who is plotting your destruction and is against the peace and welfare and best interests of the country. You are loudly called upon to dismiss Samuel D. Ingham and others. Their favorite is Calhoun. Calhoun and Ingham have intrigued to alienate Pennsylvania from your support." At the same time Jackson received additional testimony of the intrigues of Sutherland and Ingham in behalf of Calhoun. These two renegades called a Democratic meeting at which they proposed that Jackson be suported for re-nomination. But the words used in propos-

Influence of Calhoun in Pennsylvania

[52] Mss., Jackson, August 29, 1830, to Dunlap; from Wirt to Calhoun; May 29, 1830, Jackson, from Calhoun.

ing the nomination aroused the suspicion of real Jackson adherents. The proposal was to the effect that "*if* Jackson continued to administer the affairs of the general government as he had done, *then* this meeting nominated him." Jackson's friends "wanted the *if* and *then* struck out as a loop hole by which the eleventh hour men could creep out, when Calhoun's arrangements were matured." Petrikin writes to Jackson: "We repre- hended the insult contained in the cold and doubtful *if* and the danger to the country of the distracting conflict of rival candidates at Washington..... Ingham intrigued in 1823 and 1824 to secure the state for Calhoun. But they had to yield to the people's choice. After the resolution of Ingham had been negatived, you were nominated as Pennsylvania's candidate. There is no doubt that the plan put forth by Ingham was concerted in Washington to gain an expression in favor of Calhoun, and a resolution approving of Ingham. Every effort is made by this party to destroy you covertly, and advance Calhoun upon your ruins." The General began now to recognize the self interest and double dealings of many whom he had regarded as among his strongest political supporters. To Van Buren, he expresses regret at finding that many of his trusted friends who elevated him to the presidency, did so only to defeat Clay and Adams, "by which the way would be opened to their idol, Calhoun. All now who will not worship this idol are to be destroyed, or lyed down, if their intrigues can accomplish it." Jackson then referred to Ingham, Branch, and Berrien, "who compared notes and intrigued." Meanwhile Sutherland, once a loyal Jackson man, then a supporter of Calhoun against Jackson, now returned to his first love. He became a firm Jackson man "to remain so only as long as in his opinion it is to his personal interest..... He is a politician by trade, it is his vocation." Jackson accepted the whole situation with philosophical self assurance. He confided in Van Buren: "You know I never despair, I have confi-

The hopes of Calhoun's friends in the Democratic Party

dence in the virtue and good sense of the people—God is just, and while we act faithfully to the Constitution, He will smile upon and prosper our exertions.'' [53]

In national concerns, the majority of the Democrats of Pennsylvania remained firm in the cause of the Old Chief as against Calhoun. They endorsed him throughout Pennsylvania at all Democratic county meetings. Following the example of the Antimasons, the Democrats of the country met in national convention at Baltimore and failed to adopt a party platform. Thus both of these parties faced the coming elections without having committed themselves on any political issues. The Democrats blindly followed the magnetic lead of the Old Warrior and served the party regardless of policy.

National conventions in 1832

It remained for the National Republicans to espouse the the leading principles of the day, and make them a part of their party creed. On December 12, 1831, National Republican delegates from seventeen states assembled in the city of Baltimore, already popular as a rendezvous for party conventions. By unanimous vote, the delegates nominated Clay for president and John Sergeant of Pennsylvania for vice president. The convention then adjourned to meet again the following spring in the city of Washington. More than three hundred delegates were present. At this meeting Pennsylvania was represented by a larger delegation than was any other state excepting Maryland which sent fifty-two members. The delegates endorsed the nominations of the Baltimore convention and invited Clay to address them. The new candidate delivered a formal and non-committal speech. On the third day the convention highly ap-

[53] Mss., Jackson, May 29, 1830; August 29, 1831, to Dunlap; October 2, 1820, to Calhoun from Crawford; May 2, 1830, from Petrikin, Harrisburg; May 3, 1830, from Ross Wilkins; June 21, 1831, from Ingham; June 23, 1831, to Ingham; July 14, 1831, to Eaton; August 8, 1831, to Van-Buren; August 8, 1831, from J. Pemberton, Philadlephia; November 1, 1830, to Van Buren.

proved "of the wisdom and firmness of the Senate of the United States in rejecting the nomination of Martin Van Buren as minister to England, and "also applauded the independence and patriotism of John C. Calhoun, vice president, in giving the casting vote on the occasion." The president of the convention closed the meeting by this speech: "This convention is novel in its kind. Trace back the annals of all history, and this will be found to be the first instance in which the young men of a whole nation alarmed for the institutions of their country, and anxious to wipe away the national disgrace inflicted by servile, incompetent, and unworthy rulers, have assembled in solemn convention—for no other purpose than to produce that concert of action and cooperation which shall by its influence rescue the constitution and the violated laws from an imbecile and corrupt executive and place them in the hands of abler and better men." The cry of Hero of New Orleans had wearied this long suffering Anti-Jacksonite, who asked—" and should we even acknowledge the chief magistracy of our country to be a fit reward for mere military services, surely four years of wild misrule is a sufficient reward for one brilliant achievement." The Hero was not given credit for compensating acts: "Jackson deserves as much applause for the extinguishment of the national debt as he does for the returning spring, or for the approaching harvest." Clay was eulogized as "well qualified to reconcile the conflicting interests—shaking the Union to its centre." He was praised as the "firm advocate of the National Bank." In contradiction it was urged: "On one branch of policy alone has General Jackson been consistent; his opposition to the United States Bank, urged, again and again, with such zeal and perseverance—may be regarded as proceeding—from a blind hatred to the institution, stronger than any opinion." [54]

[54] Pamphlet—The National Republican Convention of 1832.

Following the attitude of their leader, all Jacksonites hated the United States Bank. Their unreasoned opposition became a fundamental part of their party creed. It is now pertinent to consider the "Bank agitation" in its aspect as a leading political issue.

CHAPTER II

Party Loyalty and An Important Political Issue

The destruction of the Second United States Bank, and the erection on its ruins of the "United States Bank of Pennsylvania" occupied the attention of politicians during the entire Jacksonian régime. To discredit the national bank in the eyes of the public was a part of Democratic propaganda. In the agricultural parts of the state, Democratic efforts met with success; but in Philadelphia, the home of the Bank, they encountered no small amount of resistence. Here the "Bankites" ridiculed the Administration policy, and by force of reasoning won over to their position a considerable number of Democrats, who for their party disloyalty suffered political ostracism. Other Democratic politicians secretly favoured the Bank; but for political reasons attacked it with relentless fury. Still others sincerely opposed the institution and reviled it with a zeal that approached fanaticism. A non-committal policy was in all cases fatal. More than one Democratic leader, notably Governor Wolf, fell a victim to party scorn, because his attitude toward the great issue was open to conflicting interpretations.

Attitude of the Democratic Party toward a national bank

As true followers of Jackson, the Democrats became the more embittered with increasing resistence. Jackson's antagonism to the Bank was beyond question; but the opposition of the Democratic party antedated Jacksonian leadership. Their opposition represented the historic attitude of the party toward the issue. It was not sudden or accidental, but hereditary and customary. In February, 1791, the great founder of the Democratic party formulated his opposition to the establishment of a

national bank. When the first Bank Charter expired in 1811, and the question of Renewal arose, the subject suffered the treatment of a partisan issue. In the Senate, it was observed that the Bank was one of the first causes which created the present parties, and that wherever it extended its influence dessention commenced. With a few notable exceptions, the Federalists supported the continued existence of the Bank, while the Democrats arrayed themselves in opposition. In 1811, Clay disliked the Bank as one of the causes of the political divisions of this country. At the same time, Pennsylvania went on record as opposing a renewal of the charter [1] and political motives were assigned for her action. One of Stephen Girard's friends is "really mortified to find (that) the Pennsylvania legislature had from party spirit thrown out the Bill for Chartering the late Bank U. States," [2] although a liberal bonus was offered. A United States Senator remarked that "In Philadelphia nearly all elasses wish for a continuance of the Bank.....even in the Northern Liberties—the very focus of Democracy—people were anixous that the charter of the bank be renewed." Business men from Philadelphia hoped that the United States would yet grant a charter. [3] But the *first bank* was destined not to be re-chartered. In 1816, the Second United States Bank was chartered for twenty years. But long before 1836, the question of a re-charter assumed increasing importance as a political issue.

The Bank, a historic issue

Opposition to the United States Bank in 1828 and in the years that followed, was not, then, wholly due to the influence of Andrew Jackson whose attitude on the subject left no room

[1] Annals of Congress, Senate, 1811, February; Ames—State Documents, page 52. We will note later that the stae as such reversed its position in regard to a National Bank, and in 1832 urged its representatives in Congress to promote the re-charter of the second United States Bank.

[2] McMaster—The Life and Times of Stephen Girard, II, 208.

[3] American State Papers—Finance II—453; Hazard, Register of Pennsylvania, September 2, 1828, page 132.

for doubt.[4] An old Democratic objection to the Bank was on the ground that much of the stock was owned by foreigners.[5] Another charge against the Bank was to the effect that it had exerted too great an influence politically.[6] Another conventional Democratic argument against the Bank came from those who naturally opposed paper money. Groups of "working people" addressed remonstrances to the state legislature to the effect that bank paper represents nothing but the credit of the banks, leaves the public without a proper means of exchange, and raises prices by creating monied corporations.[7] One of the bitterest charges which the Democrats ever leveled against the Bank was that it was a corporation and therefore unconstitutional and illegal. The whole relentless course of the party in regard to the Bank was excused on such grounds.[8]

Conventional Democratic objections to the Bank

Administration forces found it difficult to explain their position. They alluded incessantly to the dangers incident to the

[4] His first annual message declared, "Both the constitution and the expediency of the law creating this bank are well questioned by a large portion of our fellow citizens."

[5] A report submitted by Charles Chauncey in September, 1828, showed that only 214 foreigners held stock, which all told amounted to only 40,412 shares. In Pennsylvania alone 70,763 shares were divided among 954 persons. Hazard's Register of Pennsylvania, September 2, 1828; page 132.

[6] In 1829, Ingham, as Secretary of the Treasury, writes to Nicholas Biddle, President of the United States Bank: "I will not suppose that you would under any influence intentionally permit the power of the Bank to be made an instrument for the accomplishment of other objects than those for which it may be legitimately exercised." Mss., Bank Papers—July 11, 1829—(at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

[7] Harrisburg Chronicle, May 4, 1829; Mss., Van Buren, January 10, 1830.

[8] The party found a ready defendant in the historian, George Bancroft, who published articles, after submitting them for approval, "in defense of the ground generally taken by the government." In 1830 he wrote—"The present United States Bank possesses advantages wholly at variance with the rights of all other capitalists; .....the rights to free competition —ought to be held supremely sacred in a land of equal liberty." Mss., Van Buren, January 10, 1830.

Jackson's hostility toward the Second United States Bank

Bank, and to its unconstitutionality. Before submitting his second annual message, Jackson sent to Van Buren for his criticism this written comment on the Bank: "Nothing has occurred to lessen in any degree the dangers which many of our safest statesmen apprehend from that institution as at present organized, nor is the opinion of its unconstitutionality less extensive or less deeply impressed." In his message, a month later (December, 1830), Jackson again referred to the dangers "which many of our citizens apprehend" from the Bank. The President persisted in his course despite the admonitions of the more farsighted, who insisted that "the safety of the national revenue required a Bank of the United States."[9] Even official counsel was brushed aside. The President confided in Van Buren: "McLane differs with me on the Bank; still it is an honest difference of opinion and in his report he acts fairly by leaving me free and uncommitted: This I will be on that subject." That Jackson should promise to be "uncommitted" on any subject is interesting. Such a promise in regard to the bank question was inconsistent with his earlier attitude, and was short lived; nevertheless, on the same day as the letter, the message appeared in which the president left the question, "for the present, to the investigation of an enlightened people and their representatives." The "enlightened people" passed judgment at the polls, and met with the favour of their Chief; but their representatives who chose to differ with the executive found their decision negatived by a Veto which staggered public opinion.

In June, a month before the Veto, Jackson's relentless course was anticipated. A Lancaster County paper thought that "Jackson would like to substitute an absolute monarchy in lieu of a republic, and himself reign with despotic sway. He is endeavoring to destroy the United States Bank to the great detriment

[9] Jackson Mss., June 19, 1831; Clay to Brooke, in Colton, Vol. IV, page 540—June 29, 1832.

of the Commonwealth. He has felt himself bound more to his Masonic obligations than to the fundamental laws of the Constitution of the United States.'' In June, also, the Legislature at Harrisburg in both houses unanimously passed a resolution urging their representatives and senators at Washington to endeavour to obtain a renewal of the Charter of the Bank of the United States. In so doing the state reversed its early attitude in regard to a national bank. In commenting on the matter, Clay, who likewise had reversed his earlier position on the great issue, hopefully wrote: ''Pennsylvania continues daily to exhibit signs of the most cheering character and there is just reason to hope that she is lost to General Jackson.'' [10] On the eve of the veto, politicians spoke of ''the great reactions in several states of the Union, but more especially in the great states of Pennsylvania and New York.'' Several newspapers, including the Philadelphia Inquirer and The Telegraph ''hauled down the Jackson flag.'' [11] On July tenth, the anticipated Veto became a fact, and Jackson reflected: ''I have now done my duty to my country. If sustained by my fellow citizens, I shall be grateful and happy.''

The effect of Jackson's course on public opinion

As was foreshadowed, the Veto of the Bank Bill aroused a storm of protest, and an excitement that, in Governor Wolf's words, ''transcended the bounds of discretion.'' It was attacked from every angle. Public protest may be ascribed partly to the

[10] The Bank Bill was expected to pass the Senate in a few days; but as Clay warned: ''If Jackson is to be believed he will veto it.'' ''Clay, aided by Webster, fought the battle for the Bank successfully.'' The bill was passed by Congress and hurried to the President. Jackson, realizing the significance of the question, and unwilling to face the situation alone, again seeks the counsel of friend Van Buren to whom he writes: ''The coalition are determined to press upon me at this session the Bank Bill. I am prepared to meet it as I ought; but I want your aid. .....Let me see you as early as you can.'' Clay to Brooke, June 29, 1832, in Colton, Vol. IV, page 540; Mss., Jackson, June 19, 1831.

[11] Mss., Buchanan, July 8, 1832.

fact that the Veto was considered as in itself alarming. Its use in our time has become so familiar, that it is difficult for us to realize that a Veto as such could have aroused much feeling. In after years, President Taylor voiced the Whig attitude towards executive power by viewing the Veto "as an extreme measure to be resorted to only in extraordinary cases."[12] The historic Veto gave contemporaries a new view of the Executive and of his powers. In commenting on "the Veto," a Philadelphia editor of the time writes in sarcastic vein: "General Jackson wants all power, he wants a bank subservient to his wishes, a court that he can control, a senate that he can govern, a constitution that he can adopt to his own purposes. This is the man who calls himself a republican."[13] A pamphleteer of the same city reflects: "The immense power lodged in the executive of the United States was almost unknown. It had been used for the public interest only, and its capacity for evil, for party rule, was not dreaded. It remained for General Jackson to reveal its dangers."

The National Republican press attacks the Veto

Bankites who were personally affected by the Veto hoped against hope that the people would not sustain the action of the Executive, and looked for a re-action in favour of the doomed Bank. Biddle wrote to Clay in August: "You ask what is the effect of the veto? My impression is, that it is working as well as the friends of the Bank and of the country could desire. I have always deplored making the Bank a party question; but since the President will have it so, he must pay the penalty of his own rashness."

Bankites hope for a popular repudiation of the Veto

Friends of the Bank might have comforted themselves with reading the attacks against the Veto recorded in the National Republican Press. The United States Gazette of Philadelphia was

[12] See article by Fairlie—American Political Science Review—August, 1917, vol. XI. No. 3.

[13] United States Gazette, July 24, 1832.

fond of dwelling upon Jackson's ignorance of finance. In arguments economic in appearance it warned its readers that "If the Bank through Executive opposition be abolished, we may expect to see silver and gold excluded from circulation." Moreover, "what will the widows and orphans say who have vested their funds in United States Bank stock! What will the West say? what will the city of Philadelphia say which owns by Girard's will, so much of this stock?" To the farmers this erratic appeal was made: "If Jackson is re-elected, the products of your fields will not be worth as much in the market now by fifty per cent." Ingham came out with the statement that "the Bank had purified one of the worst currencies that ever infested any country or people. It consisted of mere paper of no definite value." [14]

The Bank question predominant in Philadelphia

Throughout the summer months, the bank question continued to supplant all other issues, especially in Philadelphia. Here in August the "Irish Anti-Jackson men" held in the State House Yard a meeting which was as usual the largest ever held in Philadelphia city. They resolved that Jackson had "deserted the vital interests of Pennsylvania," in vetoing the bill for Re-charter, which the Legislature of Pennsylvania had unanimously recommended in June, and which the Congress had passed by large majorities in both Houses.

A non-partisan estimate of the conduct of the General in opposing the Re-charter was more than could be expected on this side of the Atlantic. As an example of a moderating foreign estimate, we may notice the following excerpts from The London Times of July, 1832, which furnishes a closer approach to a non-partisan and unbiased contemporary opinion: "In the United States, the trade of banking and currency is perfectly free. There is a Government bank, the renewal of whose charter is, ...at this moment under consideration; but it has no monop-

Foreign comment

[14] Bucks County Intelligencer, October 29, 1832.

oly, and has had to maintain the competition with other banks." The issue of August 11, 1832, reflects: "It must seem difficult to persons unacquainted with the electioneering objects of the President or with the peculiar system of American parties to conceive why the extraordinary step of a Veto should be resorted to against the continued existence of this establishment.....

The Veto viewed as a purely political step

Curions to note, the President gives as a reason for rejecting the renewal of the charter that the foreign possessors of the stock might use their power, in case of war, against the interests of the Union.....We need scarcely say that such an objection is chimerical and absurd. The foreigners, who would in case of war have their funds in American stock, would be rather more likely to be at the mercy of the Americans than have the Americans at theirs. The real fact probably is, that President Jackson has been opposed by the Directors of the Bank in his administration: that he dreaded their influence on his ensuing election, that he wished to gain the support of the local bankers, who are hostile to the general establishment, and that he, therefore, used his Veto as one of the ways and means for occupying, for another term of four years, the elective sovereignty of a great umpire."[15] From London, Vail writes to Van Buren: "The Bank Veto is not very popular among the few Americans here. Some say that you arrived at Washington with the Veto message in your packet, written on the passage."

At home, the Veto did not have the political effect which its opponents desired. Through sheer popularity and the impulse of party loyalty, Jackson carried the day. A large Jackson

Jackson's popularity in the state

meeting in Philadelphia resolved to support the Old Chief, Bank or no Bank, Veto or no Veto.[16] Throughout the political furore, the majority of the Democrats remained loyal to their Chief. In

[15] The London Times, July 23, 1832; August 11, 1832.

[16] Mss., Van Buren, August 22, 1832; Mss., Buchanan, August 1, 1832, from George Plitt.

mass meetings they extolled him for his "Roman firmness in daring to restore the purity and virtue which are the only safeguards of the Republic." They denied that the Veto was unconstitutional; they urged on the contrary that it represented a vindication of the constitution. A Jackson Veto meeting in Marietta, Pennsylvania, regarded the rejection of the United States Bank bill by our venerable President as another illustration of his inflexible integrity, and unwavering devotion to the principles of the constitution.[17] Discerning politicians realized even in July that nothing could "shake the hold the General has rightfully on the affections of the people." There could be "no doubt of the election of the Old Chief and Martin." The majority of the Democrats continued to applaud the Veto as an act of unprecedented bravery. A cartoon of the time represents Jackson as a cat—"the famous New Orleans mouser," clearing Uncle Sam's Barn of Bank and Clay Rats while Uncle Sam and his active laborers enjoy the sport. On the cat's tail is written *Veto*.[18] As the weeks passed by, it appeared that the Democrats of the state were becoming more determined to support the Veto. In August, a Democrat from Lancaster writes confidently to Buchanan, then abroad: "The president has vetoed the Bank Bill.....This it was thought (and perhaps was intended for that effect) would lose him the vote of Pennsylvania. This is, however a mistake; Pennsylvania is still for Jackson; the German population remains unshaken in its attachment to the Chief." It was now predicted that in Berks the people would give as great a majority for Jackson as they gave four years before. Democrats felt there would be no sensible change in Pennsylvania on the day of election. Before the end

Throughout the summer, Democrats generally support The Veto

[17] United States Gazette, July 22, 1832; The Columbia Spy, August 18, 1832.

[18] Library of Congress, Mss. Department, date of cartoon, September 17, 1832.

of the summer "every single one of the Democratic papers in Pennsylvania came out in favour of the Veto."

In the fall, many Democrats repudiate Jackson

But with the approach of Autumn, signs of dissatisfaction within the party began to make their appearance, and in less than two weeks certain Administration papers turned their backs upon Jackson and Jacksonism. The Philadelphia Inquirer, a recognized Democratic organ, became "an instrument in the hands of the Clay men for the purpose of producing schism and mischief among us (the Democrats) whenever opportunity offers." At the same time, the Administration enthusiasts were obliged to concede that the Veto might lose Jackson some votes in Philadelphia, Chambersburg and Pittsburg; in Schuylkill, also, it was admitted the veto had "injured the Democrats some." An ever increasing number of Democrats now began to secede from their party and to organize under the term—"Independent-Democrats." Their repudiation of Jackson caused the Democrats no end of alarm. The fall elections were close at hand, and if all the dissatisfied elements united, were to win the gubernatorial election in October, the state might be lost to Jackson in the November election.

In the Southeastern quarter of the state pro-Bank activities were especially strong, for it was here that "Antis" and "Clay Men" and "Bank Men" were making a united and great effort to defeat Wolf and if successful to take Pennsylvania from Old Hickory.[19] Anti-Masonic meetings assailed Wolf as incompetent, because he was believed to be "willing to assist in the destruction of the United States Bank."

The gubernatorial election of 1832

But the entire opposition combined could not succeed in gaining a gubernatorial victory.[20] As the Administration party anticipated, Wolf was elected (in 1832) by a large majority. He

[19] Buchanan Mss., from Reynolds, August 15, 1832; October 15, 1832.

[20] That honor was reserved for them in the next election three years later, when the Democratic party suffered internal dissension.

lost Philadelphia city though carrying the county. The example of Philadelphia city—the home of the Bank—infused new zeal and hope into the ranks of the National Republican party.[21] At the same time it was a cause for alarm to the opposition, who, nevertheless, predicted a great presidential victory over the forces of Bankism. The November elections showed that Jackson carried all the electoral votes of the state and won a popular vote of over 90,000 as against over 56,000 given to Clay. Thus the state had registered approval of Jackson and his party. The pro-Bank sentiment in Philadelphia was overshadowed by the attitude of the rest of the state. More than one politician now alluded to "the redeeming spirit among us of the honest Germans that has made the Democracy Victorious." Great was the rejoicing of the Jacksonites. At Doylestown, a hickory pole was raised by the Hurra boys, who spent the night watching it while they played the fife and drum. Jackson was much impressed by the good showing which Pennsylvania had made. Exultantly he writes to Buchanan, then our minister in Russia: "In the late election, good old Democratic Pennsylvania has greatly increased my debt of gratitude to her, which I can only attempt to discharge by renewed and increasing vigilence and exertions in so administering the government as to perpetuate the prosperity and happiness of the whole people." From St. Petersburg, Jackson received these congratulations from Buchanan: "I rejoice over the victory which you have gained over the combined forces of National Republicanism, Anti-Masonry, Bankism and all the other -isms which have been arrayed in opposition to you."[22]

The presidential election

Jackson's gratitude for "good old Democratic Pennsylvania"

[21] Bucks County Intelligencer, August 13, 1832; United States Gazette, October 16, 1832.

[22] Mss., Buchanan, December 18, 1832; Bucks County Intelligencer, November 5, 1832; Mss., Jackson, March 21, 1833, to Buchanan; December 20, 1832, from Buchanan.

And still the Bank hoped for a re-charter,[23] although it was generally realized that Jackson would consistently pursue his avowed policy.

Governor Wolf's Bank policy

A similar attitude of positive denunciation was looked for from Governor Wolf, who was the successful candidate and head of the party in Pennsylvania. But Wolf's Bank policy was destined to prove disappointing to his Democratic following; his attitude on the question had been independent, or at least lukewarm. His December (1832) message stated: "The Bank of the United States, whatever may be alleged to the contrary, has certainly done the country some service."....."It would be a subject of regret if a too strict adherence to a literal construction of the constitution in regard to the powers conferred upon Congress by that instrument to establish such an institution or a too critical analysis of its expediency in a moral or political point of view, or the imprudent, intemperate and impetuous zeal of its friends and those entrusted with its government.....should have the effect to prevent a renewal of its charter." Such liberal reasoning was bound to cost any Democrat much support from his own party. Wolf remained calm in the midst of the Bank agitation when partisan policy would have dictated a more direct course of open hostility to the Gross Monopoly. What Wolf's alleged friendship for the Bank was to cost him three years later we shall see in the ensuing chapter.

In contrast, Jackson's consistent action left no room for doubt. His message of the same time charged the bank with being "no longer a safe depository of the money of the people." In the following March, the House of Representatives of the United States resolved "that the government deposites may, in the opinion of the House, be safely continued in the Bank of the

[23] On November 12, stocks rose; but when it was felt that the charter would not be renewed on any terms, the shares fell again; United States Gazette, November 14, 1832; December 1, 1832.

United States." Again, Jackson felt impelled to disregard the "enlightened people's representatives." [24] In September, he explained that the question of a recharter had been decided at the election and that he considered his "re-election as a decision of the people against the bank." He declared that the responsibility was thrown upon the Executive branch of the Government of deciding how long before the expiration of the charter, the public interest would require the deposits to be placed elsewhere. In his opinion the near approach of the termination of the charter, and public considerations justified the removal. October first, 1833, was fixed as the final day for the change of the deposits. On September 26, the order for removal was given. [25]

The Removal of the deposits

Removal intensified the political furore precipitated by the Veto Outrage. The United States Gazette—the protagonist of the Bank, declared: The Administration at Washington have been told that such is the popularity of Jackson in Philadelphia that do the worst act he can, he will be sustained by the majority of voters there. The paper which stated the reasons for Removal ignored all Congressional expressions of disapproval and alluded to the oft reiterated Jacksonian argument that the election of 1832 had sealed the doom of the Bank. Prejudice and fanaticism

Political excitement intensified

[24] Furtively, he wrote to Van Buren: "The Bank and change of deposits have engrossed my mind very much, is a preplexing subject, and I wish your opinion before I finally act. This is the only difficulty I see now on our way. I must meet it fearlessly." But according to the Bank Act of April the tenth, 1816, "the deposits of the money of the United States.... shall be made in said Bank....unless the Secretary of the Treasury shall ....otherwise order and direct." Jackson, then must needs find a Secretary, "subservient to his wishes." Sutherland whose hidden hand arose occasionally to the surface was "set against Removal." He insisted that Jackson would not get the deposits removed, and that even Duane, who had declared himself open to conviction, was determined not to remove them. Mss., Van Buren, June 6, 1833; Mss., Jackson, August 11, 1833, from Amos Kendall.

[25] Jackson determined to use the state banks as places of deposit, and selected for that purpose in the city of Philadelphia, the Girard Bank. All the public money after September 30, 1833, should be here deposited.

under political direction have more than once swayed elections designed as tests of approval or disapproval. Non-partisan judgment and unfettered reasoning have more than once been overruled by party considerations. The President's high handed policy provoked the indignation of the country. Cartoonists were fond of representing Jackson as a king. In one sketch he is crowned with Martin Van Buren at the right. In another, he plays the fiddle and rests his foot upon the constitution. His czar-like qualities, if not appreciated at home, awakened interest abroad. Buchanan writes: A Russian nobleman said, "It was a pity that such a man as you (Jackson) had not been king of England instead of William IV, for then Ireland would have been kept in good order, and O'Connell would long since have been punished as he deserved." [26]

More than a month before the order for Removal was given, the Bank realizing its fate, began operations to curtail. From August 13. until April 1. (1834), an enormous reduction in discounts had been contemplated. "Since the state banks had to contract to a proportionate degree, the suffering occasioned by the decrease of banking facilities must have been extreme." [27] Failures began in January. On the twenty-seventh, Van Buren is told of the suffering of ten millions of people caused by the act of one man. One correspondent writes: "The feeling in the working classes is getting to be such that it would not surprise me if in less than ninety days they should demand at the point of the bayonet a redress of their grievances." Great public meetings were held in Philadelphia in the state house yard for the purpose of considering the "existing pecuniary pressure pervading all classes of the community and threatening to prostrate the whole productive industry of the country." [28] In a large num-

Political meetings of protest

[26] Jackson Mss., May 22, 1834.

[27] Catterall—The Second United States Bank—chapter XIII.

[28] Van Buren Mss., January 27, 1834; Wolf Mss., January 4, 1834.

ber of these meetings, the action of the president was attacked as unconstitutional, and a restoration of the deposits was demanded as the only remedy for the prevailing financial evils. On January thirtieth, a gathering of the "Untrammeled People" of the Northern Liberties, Philadelphia, regarded the national Legislative and not the Executive as the Constitutional guardian of the National Treasury. Another meeting resolved that the Executive has no legislative power whatever excepting the veto. They regarded the removal of the deposits as a violation of the public faith pledged to the Bank, for "the Secretary of the Treasury is the fiscal agent of the government and nothing more: he has no legislative power." They disapproved of the removal, for it was a violation of the laws of congress and of the constitution, and was an alarming usurpation and abuse of power. Many other political gatherings requested Congress to restore the deposits. A National Republican meeting in Spring Garden and Penn Township recommended that their representatives in Congress "compel the dictator to disgorge the treasure of the people." Similar sentiments were expressed at a gathering of shoe makers in the city of Philadelphia. They spoke of the removal as a disregard by the President of the constitution and the laws, for, "The action of Congress specifying that the public funds were safe in the Bank of the United States was a true expression of the national voice,.....and.....the removal within the short space of sixty days before the meeting of the present congress was an overt act of the President, altogether uncalled for, and was an arbitrary exercise of power." The meeting concluded: "If all that has been said against the Bank was true .....it would be far better that such a state of things should be than that one drop of human blood should be shed in civil discord."

Political unrest in Philadelphia

Many in Jackson's own party sternly disapproving of the course of their Chief at Washington, joined the ranks of the In-

dependent-Democrats. Such a group met on the twenty-sixth, and summed up the situation rather fairly: "The distress, they felt, "must be principally attributed to the removal and especially to the impolicy of removing the deposits at this time, for if they had remained with the Bank for the four and one-half years which remained for it to wind up its concerns, the inconvenience would have been comparatively light. But the sudden, ill-timed and ill-advised removal of the deposites had compelled the Bank to withhold the customary public accommodations, or had afforded it a pretext for withholding them, to produce a re-action of public opinion in its favor. Until the deposits were removed public opinion was assumed to be settled against the Bank." They concluded, that "no part of the public deposites had been extended for political purposes." Another town meeting of Independent Democrats thus registered their sentiments: "The scheme to destroy the Bank by removing the deposites was to promote New York state above her rival Philadelphia, for New York wants to control finances as well as the trade with the West. If the present Bank should not be re-chartered, we hope that no similar institution will ever again be created until the constitution shall be so altered as expressly to permit it." They resolved that "the removal was impolitic because the public mind was diverted from the only questions which should occupy it in relation to the Bank: its constitutionality and public convenience, to another object—calculated to enlist the passions of the people and prevent that cool and dispassionate consideration so important a subject demands.....Moreover, the public has an interest in the stock of the Bank to the amount of seven millions which has depreciated." Another such meeting saw in the Removal a violation of the public faith pledged to the Bank, because, by the terms of the charter, the deposits were to be made with it on certain conditions which had been fully complied with by the Bank. The chairman of the meeting said, "Al-

The attitude of the Independent-Democrats

though we have always given to Jackson our warm support, we think it the duty and privilege of freemen to express our opinions. As Pennsylvanians we hail with delight the bright example of our ancient and honorable ally—Virginia, and are ready with her to rally again on the doctrines of '98 to restrain the encroachments of executive power, to sustain the rights of the States.'' [29] Thus the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798 and 1799, though denounced by Pennsylvania in 1799 as revolutionary and ''destructive of the purest principles of our state and national compacts,'' were approved by local political meetings. The position of the executive was attacked in a large assemblage of tin plate workers, sheet iron workers and copper smiths of Philadelphia, Southwark, and Northern Liberties; they met at Independence Hotel and declared that ''the executive has not the right of judging of the constitutionality of any law or of suspending the operation of any law,'' and resolved that ''the chief magistrate is influenced by advisers who are goading him on to try his present experiment which we believe will prostrate the best interests of the country, creating unnecessary distress.'' The meeting regretted that the act of the president in overruling the decision of the late Secretary of the Treasury on the question of Removal should add another to the many proofs of a disposition in the executive councils to concentrate all power in the hands of a single individual and thus to mould the government more nearly to the monarchical form.[30] Similar sentiments against Removal were expressed by newspaper editors and by

State Rights doctrines enunciated in Pennsylvania

[29] At almost the same time an opposition meeting quoted the historic resolutions in support of their position in favor of Jackson's action. In their own words: ''This meeting approves of the Jeffersonian doctrine of state rights as contained in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of '98 and '99, and believes that the chartering of a Mammoth Monopoly by the national government tends to endanger the preservation of those rights, and the stability of our free institutions.''

[30] Contemporary Leaflets, preserved at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, dates, January and February, 1834.

pamphleteers. All demanded a re-charter as the only relief for the financial distress.

This loyal Democrats as rigorously opposed. Resolutions of Democratic meetings of citizens in Northampton and in other counties heartily approved of Removal, and opposed re-chartering. Democratic literature attributed financial depression to the Bank itself rather than to Jackson. A Van Buren correspondent writes: "All our difficulties proceed from the *malice* and *revenge* of the Bank, which is now more able than ever to relieve the country, if it would. Still I trust.....the Old Chief will remain as immovable as the everlasting hills. The convulsive throes of the Mammoth cannot last long. A calm will come and it will be the calm of freedom. If the Bank is to be re-chartered, we have gained but little by the Revolution and the constitution is a solemn mockery. I would about as lief bequeath my children the blessings of the British Monarchy, as commit them and their descendants to the mercy of a *perpetual monied aristocracy.*"[31] A meeting in Erie County approved of the conduct of Taney, and resolved that the Bank cannot be trusted, and that the "idea held out by the bank that the distress complained of in our commercial cities is owing to the removal of the deposites is as fallacious as it is preposterous. The true cause of the depressure in the Money Market, is the curtailment by the Bank of its usual accommodations. If banks are necessary, we would prefer local banks." A resolution endorsing Jackson and Van-Buren and removal of the deposits was adopted by the citizens of Upper Mount Bethel, Pennsylvania.[32] A Democratic meeting at Pittsburg thus complained of the Bank: An *unlimited power* was granted by the board of directors to the President of the Bank to expend its funds for electioneering purposes, thereby unlawfully squandering the public treasure and attempting to bring

Loyal Jacksonians support Removal

[31] Van Buren Mss., February 22, 1834; March 24, 1834.
[32] Van Buren Mss., February 2, 4, 1834.

into disrepute the government of the country. Blockly Township in Philadelphia County was content with merely registering a simple approval of Jackson's course. A Democratic meeting of the third Congressional district of Philadelphia thus interpreted Jackson's constitutional position: "The President is accountable to the people, and to them alone. The present commercial distress owes its origin to the policy of the Bank of the United States. The renewal of the charter would be dangerous to the rights, liberties and happiness of these United States. The effect, which the Bank has been able to produce in the community tends to convince us that its existence during a time of war would be exceedingly dangerous, as it might then be found arrayed against the government and the *people*, and sustaining the cause of a foreign foe."

In the midst of the financial storm, Democratic party leaders remained loyal to the Chief; Buchanan writes to Colonel Page: "All's well at Harrisburg. The party are firm and decided in support of Jackson's administration, and in opposition to the Bank." Much of this loyalty may be ascribed to ulterior motives. A Pennsylvania politician writes to Van Buren: The party press and party leaders do not dare represent the truth (result of Removal of Deposites) as it is, for fear of being *suspected* and consequently excommunicated from the party (Democratic). Party loyalty was thus placed above patriotism and even above that duty to the locality demanded by higher laws. Many Democratic leaders faced the distress and suffering incident to the financial upheaval, satisfied that they had adhered to the dictated course of the party. Many of these leaders while openly supporting the policy of the administration, secretly regretted Jackson's course. A prominent Democrat confesses to Wolf that "Many of Jackson's sincere friends would have been better satisfied had the removal of the deposits from the Bank of the United States not happened. But as it has been done, many

Party loyalty versus personal conviction

think it would be bad policy to desert the Administration by voting for their restoration." Another party man, regretting Jackson's course, and reverting to original causes, lamented even the founding of the much maligned Bank. He felt that Madison should not have signed the law authorizing the Charter. He writes: "I consider Mr. Madison's surrender of the safe doctrines of the days of his vigour and sanity as the only great political error of this life, and I am told by his most ardent friends from that state now in Congress that Madison was overwhelmed by the importunities of those who had perhaps no other object but self aggrandizement or private gain.....Do not let us ever admit that the permanent prosperity of this country depends upon a corporation, especially one filled with the deepest hostility towards our Republican institutions." [33]

Anti-Bank sentiment in Chester County

Removal had been followed in the Spring (1834) by the legislative vote of censure, and the consequent executive Protest. A conspicuous element in the Democratic party still followed Jackson—in fact their enthusiasm was further stimulated by the attack on the "defender of their liberties." In West Chester a county meeting resolved that the Senate of the United States in passing resolutions of censure against the President violated the spirit of the Constitution, that Jackson's Protest against the proceedings of the Senate of the United States was an able exposition of the powers of the Executive, and that the House of Representatives in sustaining the President faithfully discharged the duty they owed to their country. Democrats everywhere fervently claimed to believe that Jackson had put down "one of the greatest of enemies to our constitution." Their suggestion was, let the United States Bank "expire, however terrific its dying struggle." In Chester County, the supporters of the Bank were few and far between. The Jackson men of this county

[33] Mss., Buchanan, January 17, 1834; Mss., Wolf, January 22, 1834, from Wagner.

claimed that such a being as a Bankite was not known in their part of the country. Anti-Bank meetings were frequently held at the Turk's Head Inn (in West Chester) where resolutions were passed to discredit the Monster Monopoly. At a meeting on the ninth of June, the good citizens even went so far as to oppose all monied institutions, "on account of the universal tendency of Banks to identify those concerned in them as a distinct body from the rest of the community." In the neighboring county of Delaware, antagonism to the Bank was almost as bitter as in Chester County. Throughout the spring, Democratic meetings to oppose the Bank were frequent. On March twenty-fifth occurred the "largest meeting of Democrats ever held in Delaware County. From five to six hundred farmers, mechanics and labourers assembled to show the advocates of the Bank that there were yet some few left who "would not wear the golden collar." In Philadelphia, at a "largest Democratic meeting," C. J. Ingersoll offered these resolutions: Paper money, bank credits, and stocks are not the sources or reliances of American republican prosperity; the wealth of the United States is their soils, industrial labor, and economic commerce; funding systems chartered monopolies, paper currency, and monied aristocracies are always sure to bring evils upon a people. The Federal constitution never anticipated any other than a hard money currency.[34] Jackson's course received no end of approval from prominent citizens throughout the state. Richard Rush writes to Van Buren: "the Old Chief has shown himself quite as sagacious a civil warrier in this matter as he has already been a military one."[35]

[34] Coryell Mss., from Beaumont, January 15, 1834; Chronicle of the Times, July 22, 1834; Van Buren Mss., September 28, 1834.

[35] Van Buren Mss., July 30, 1834; Bucks County Intelligencer, June 2, 1834; Chronicle of the Times, June 17, 1834; Chester County Democrat, May 20, 1834; April 1, 1834; June 24, 1834—quoting the "Reading Chronicle;" June 9, 1834; November 25, 1834.

The Democrats accused the Bankites of having regularly organized propaganda by which to enlighten the people. According to Jacksonite accounts, "extra Commercial Heralds were deposited in almost every house to be followed by Bank memorials for signatures." The Democrats felt that their side of the question had not been represented by the Press as fully as the cause deserved. In their own words: "Never was so good a cause so badly sustained by its professed advocates." Of the newspapers published in Pennsylvania, eighty-four were Anti-Jackson organs; of these, seven were published in German. Of the Jackson papers, sixty-three were in English and ten in German. In addition to the Jackson and Anti-Jackson sheets, four were neutral and one was for Van Buren. According to a Jacksonite claim, there were published in the state from sixty to seventy Democratic newspapers of which number only three favored the re-charter of the Bank. One of the bitterest Anti-Bank papers was the Chester County Democrat of West Chester. This publication saw presented in the Bank issue, this alarming alternative: "Shall the Bank rule, or shall the management of our government remain in the hands of the people?" The editors described the question as a contest between the people and an aristocratic monopoly, for "the Bank is no longer a fiscal end, it has become the mere means of accomplishing a political end, which is to overthrow the government and erect a Bank Government." An opposition paper, The Village Record, put forth every effort to support the Bank only to meet with the scorn that results from prejudice.

Berks County

In Berks County as in Chester County, there was no small amount of Bank opposition. Here, the Democratic organ, The Chronicle of the Times, adopted as its motto: "Jackson, liberty and No Bank." To the opposition, they attributed the title: "Federal-Bank—Wig (sic) Anti-Jackson-Anti-Masonic ticket," favoring "Nicholas Biddle's Constitution, and the United States

Bank laws.'' The Chronicle scorned the Bank, carrying their dramatic fervour to an absurdity characteristic of the time. In July, they wrote: The Bank being ''souliess, cannot feel shame;'' ''the original purpose of its framers was to get money; the object of its present managers is to acquire power. The former were a desperate set of speculators—the latter a conclave of tyrants.'' In October, they praised Jackson as remaining ''firm in his opposition to the Monster,'' for he ''knew that the price of the people's liberty could never be purchased by a British Bank in America, ...the question is, shall the Bank or the People rule the country. It is an immense *British Monopoly* in the heart of the Republic.''

Such tragic statements were offset by the equally dramatic utterances of an Anti-Jackson paper published in the same community: The Bucks County Intelligencer opposed Jackson with great vigor and was guilty of the following parody: ''Who is the greatest tyrant—George III or Andrew the First. He has usurped the legislative power of our Senate. He has dissolved his Cabinets repeatedly, for opposing with many firmness his invasions on the right of the people. He has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing submission to the judgment of the Supreme Court and declaring that the laws should be administered as he understands them. He has erected a multitude of new offices, and scattered over the land swarms of officers to control our elections, to harass our people. He has trampled upon our charter, abolished our most valuable institutions.[36]

The position of Jackson on the great issue had not been shrouded in generalities. His bitterest enemies and warmest friends alike could not complain of a non-committal attitude, or of any change of front. We have contrasted his course, strong,

[36] Chronicle of the Times, September 30, 1834; July 22, 1834; October 7, 1834; Bucks County Intelligencer, April 14, 1834.

Jackson's attitude toward the Bank contrasted with that of Wolf

or perhaps stubborn with the less committal position of Governor Wolf, whose message in 1832 had been open to a variety of interpretations, as to the author's standing on the Bank issue. The Gubernatorial message of February 26, 1834, though much more bitter against the Bank, was scarcely more satisfactory. The strongest assertion against the Bank is in these words: "It cannot be disguised that we have amongst us a powerful monied institution, which is at this time seeking, by all the means of which it is capable, to accomplish certain objects indispensable to its existence, and having an energetic, a firm and unbending antagonist to contend against, all its energies and all its powers (and they are of no ordinary character) have been put in motion to defeat his measures and to frustrate his designs in relation to it." One Democratic editor could find in this message "not a positive expression against the Bank," and yet, a meeting in Philadelphia read into the message "unexpected hostility to the Bank." Likewise, a Democratic meeting in April, expressed "confidence in Wolf for his decided stand against the recharter." A Jackson meeting in Delaware County approved of the course of Wolf in exposing the intrigues of the Bank. In the North and West, especially in Washington and Pike Counties, meetings approved of the recent message. In May, Wolf refers in a letter to "my opposition to the present Bank of the United States" and shows how he resisted every overture from the Whigs to support the Bank. In his own words: "I was assailed and urged and pressed over and over again by committees representing public meetings as well as by members of the Legislature and private individuals, friends of the Bank, to come out in favor of that institution, and I as uniformly declined doing so." In the same letter, Wolf says: "No man ever heard me say I would send a message to the Legislature either in favor of or against the Bank of the United States." Wolf had been accused at Washington of having promised to do so. The promise was

supposedly made to the Sheriff of Allegheny County, who reported the incident to Clay. Clay reiterated the charge and spoke of Wolf's changed attitude on the Bank question. Wolf regarded this as a "foul slander," and one of his friends answered Clay to the effect that, "if Governor Wolf had changed his opinion as to the present Bank, he did not do more than his friend from Kentucky, who in 1811 was very hostile to a Bank and now was its able advocate." The charge that Wolf had changed his mind in regard to the Bank issue was regarded by Democrats as a political trick played for its effect in Pennsylvania. Vaux feels that Wolf did much service "in putting Pennsylvania in her quality as a state against the Bank." He assures Van Buren: "I owe him a large debt for that service to my country."[37] The fact that Wolf's opinion on one of the most vital issues of the day was uncertain leads us to say that he did not wish to commit himself too strongly on the subject. A Fourth of July gathering in Berks County toasted the Governor whose "patriotic principles in relation to the Bank endears him to every friend of Democracy." To many others, both in and out of the party, Wolf's position on the Bank was unsatisfactory. "The Mechanics of Philadelphia" urged him to commit himself on the issue. A Whig paper sees the matter in another light, and speaks of Wolf's *miserable truckling* to the powers at Washington, and of his abandonment of the interests of Pennsylvania in regard to the Bank. A Democratic paper declared that the Bank —a germ of aristocratic federalism was always treated "with marked kindness by Governor Wolf—while the Governor offered the lip service of devotion to the President, all the force and influence of his position was indirectly exercised to retard and defeat the cardinal measures of his administration."

[37] Democratic State Journal, May 11, 1835; Chester County Democrat, December 23, 1834; Wolf Mss., May 9, 2, 12, 1834; Van Buren Mss., April 27, 1835.

The effect on Wolf's political fortunes

The fact that Wolf's assertions on the Bank question did not meet with the demands of radical Democratic leaders, led to the rise of a rival candidate within the party. The Bank question was the star by which Muhlenberg rose into prominence. His avowed policy was to support Jackson and to help put down the "British Bank." Many Democratic papers now preferred him to Wolf, because "Wolf has not come out against a United States Bank." By the "Democratic State Journal" at Harrisburg, Muhlenberg was regarded as the only candiate whose motto, like Van Buren's, was "uncompromising hostility to the United States Bank, and all other oppressive monopolies." In a speech to Philadelphia working men, Muhlenberg said, "I am opposed to the present or any other national bank." A Fayette County Democratic meeting approved of Muhlenberg and Van Buren as opponents of the Bank and resolved that "the immense loans made and continually making by the Bank is full proof, upon its own rules of evidence that it is determined to triumph over the people." The faction of the Democratic party which remained satisfied with Wolf, attempted to discredit the rising candidate by accusing him of being in favor of the Bank. His friends hastened to answer the "nefarious charge," for "Muhlenburg had voted in Congress against its re-charter." The fact that Muhlenberg was openly and positively opposed to the re-charter was regarded by his friends as sufficient grounds to induce the people to abandon Wolf, for the Bank remained an "instrument in the hands of the enemies of our country more powerful in destroying its liberties than their thousand ships of war and their millions of men." A Schuylkill County meeting resolved to support no man for office who is in favor of a Re-charter. They recognized in Muhlenburg an uncompromising foe to the Bank, and the man whose pledge is in accordance with the convictions of his mind, to carry out in our state government, the principles of Jackson's administration in the general gov-

The rise of Muhlenberg

ernment. Thus Muhlenburg, in being a stanch Jacksonite and a consequent opponent of the Bank, met with the hearty approval of his party.

Conversely, the Anti-Jackson Party and their candidate Ritner were attacked because of their support of the Bank. Against the Anti-Masons the charge was leveled: "The re-charter of the Bank is their first darling object. The rise or fall of Free Masonry is a subject of perfect indifference with their leaders." In Westmoreland County, a meeting resolved that "the Democracy of this state view with contempt the subterfuge resorted to by the amalgamation of Anti-Masons and United States Bank men in endeavoring to force upon the state Joseph Ritner as a candidate for Governor, after his declaration "that no man with a sound head or a pure heart could be opposed to the United States Bank." A Perry County meeting saw in the coming gubernatorial election only a contest between the "aristocratic Bank candidate, Ritner, and the Democratic Anti-Bank candidate, Muhlenberg." [38]

Ritner, "the Bank candidate"

Even to the bitter end, Jackson and his political following persisted in condemning the Bank, which they had succeeded in destroying. The President's December message was sufficiently denunciatory to satisfy the most relentless Bank opponent. He described the institution as "the scourge of the people," and congratulated Congress and the country in having the "virtue and firmness to bear the affliction." Van Buren received this exultant comment from Beaver, Pennsylvania: "The Bank partisans must try some other hobby. Jackson has achieved a greater victory—one that redounds more to his honor and to the welfare of his country than in the defeat and overthrow of the enemy on the plains of Orleans. To you the nation will shortly look for a

[38] Bucks County Intelligencer, April 22, 1835; Democratic State Journal, April 30, 1835; August 1, 1835; August 22, 1835; August 8 and 15, 1835; September 15, 1835.

continuation of the same policy. Pennsylvania will lead the way in 1836. We have nothing to fear from the combined fragments we have to contend with.'' [39] Thus the year closed, leaving the Democrats still confident.

At the opening of the new year (1835) the Bank question remained the paramount issue for subsequent campaigns. Meetings continued to denounce Banks and all other monopolies as inimical to their interests. In Philadelphia, ''A Voice from the Workingmen'' declared that ''no candidate for public offices could be elected unless he was opposed to all chartered monopolies.'' In Tioga County, a Democratic meeting looked ''for the substitution of gold and silver for Bank notes.'' At the same time Democratic meetings in Butler and Mercer Counties approved of the President's course in regard to the United States Bank. [40] Thus, even to the very last, loyal Democrats upheld their party by extolling its Chief and denouncing its pet aversion—the ill fated Second United States Bank. [41]

''The re-charter'' of the ''United States Bank of Pennsylvania''

Continued financial depression, and agitation which would not down, led business men to consider the chances of a charter for a bank properly restricted and limited. Many even of Jackson's friends were willing to support such a project. With the distress increasing, and the elections drawing near, party workers advised Van Buren to ''save the situation'' they wanted him to realize that ''great commercial interests of the United States require a Bank,'' and asked, ''What reliance can be placed on a thousand independent, local banks scattered over the United States with capital enough only to satisfy their local wants?'' In the state of Pennsylvania, the urgent need for an institution to replace the defunct United States Bank, led many to believe that the state should ''re-charter the old Bank.'' Many of the meet-

[39] Van Buren Mss., December 12, 1834.

[40] Chester County Democrat, January 5, 6, 1835.

[41] Wolf Mss., January 24, 1834; Van Buren Mss., March 10, 1834.

ings which in 1834 had opposed re-chartering the Bank specifically disapproved "of the project of a re-charter by Pennsylvania." The western counties were in the anomolous position of favoring the destruction of a bank which had furthered their interests by furnishing the state with loans necessary to complete the great system of internal improvements. A substitute for the Monster Monopoly was imperative. The successor was to appear under the paradoxical name, "The United States Bank of Pennsylvania." The "old name was retained because it had great credit in the commercial world." Yet its retention led to unending opposition from Democrats who persisted in associating the new project with the old name and condemning it with equal bitterness. "The State Journal" quoting from Jackson's message, wrote: "'The Scourge of the People'—The Bank of the United States—after having been signally defeated by the firmness of Jackson, in its deliberate attempt to subjugate the U. States, (sic) has turned its attention to more limited dominion.....The members of the Pennsylvania Legislature are considering granting a charter to the Bank of the United States. The Monster, though driven from the field, will not retire without another struggle." "The Bank, which dies under the law of the Union as an unconstitutional monied monopoly on March third, 1836, is battering at the gates of the capitol (sic) for a renewed life from the legislature of a state which she has threatened and cajoled. The bank is to have its lair, like the tiger, in Pennsylvania, with liberty to stretch its claws into every sister state that will recognize the lordly beast, as the true monarch of overgrown and aristocratic monopolies." An Indiana County meeting decided that the Bank of the United States was "the most dangerous institution which ever existed in the American Republic." Clearfield County acquiesced, and Juniata County declared that the Bank had been condemned by the American people. A bill for the re-charter of the Bank for thirty years at

a bonus of $2,000,000 was introduced into the Legislature, and passed in February by fifty-seven to thirty votes. By its opponents it was termed the Bank Bribery Bill, the bonus being scorned as "a bribe to buy the freemen of the Commonwealth." Five Senators hesitating at first, were finally won over to pass the bill. They were ever after designated as "the Five Arnolds enrolled in the cause of the British Bank." Classed among the Arnolds was Charles B. Penrose, a "formerly sound and incorruptible Democrat of the Senate who nevertheless yielded to the vile offers of the Bank."[42] Penrose was bitterly assailed by those of his constituents who opposed the "monopoly." His course was attacked as inconsistent, for formerly as a staunch Jackson man he had been an opponent of the United States Bank. The American Volunteer, a Harrisburg publication, thus recorded its disapproval: "The extraordinary inconsistent and suicidal course of Senator Penrose, in reference to the re-charter of the United States Bank, has astonished some of his political opponents; on April 19, 1834, he delivered to the Senate an Anti-Bank speech. Later, he favored the Bank. Will any man be bold enough to say that Penrose is honest either in politics or morals? Will not the whole community say that he sold himself to the Bank for sordid avarice?" "Our talented Senator, the Hon. Charles B. Penrose, is a man with three faces; he has worn three different profiles since June, 1832, in regard to the Bank." It may be explained that Penrose's course appeared inconsistent to his constituents, because they failed to distinguish between the National Bank and the new state Bank. They regarded both as aristocratic monopolies and the new bank was to them fully as "dangerous" as its predecessor—the United States Bank, and should have been voted down by a consistent opponent of the old Bank. It is strange that the charge of inconsistency should

Popular opposition

The apparently inconsistent course of Charles B. Penrose

[42] Pennsylvania Reporter and State Journal, November 28, 1835; January 22, 1836; February 16, 2, 4, 1836.

have been leveled against Penrose, when his position was that although the United States Bank had been unconstitutional, a state bank chartered by a state was not open to any such constitutional objection. In fact he stated that "the establishment of a state bank is the only way to prevent the establishment of a national bank, and that the establishment of the state bank presented no constitutional objections. In an address before the citizens of the counties of Cumberland and Perry, he explained his attitude by the obvious remark that no state government can charter a national bank. As advantages accruing from the new state bank, he mentioned that the specie would be kept in the state, that the tax law could be repealed and $5,000,000 secured for internal improvements and for the school fund, thus enlightening the people without taxing them. The wonderful new institution would open up the resources of the state and the iron and coal industries would be furthered.[43] As might be expected, this speech was heartily endorsed by Bank papers. "The Chambersburg Whig" contained the glowing tribute: "So long as we have men amongst us like Penrose whose devotion to the interests of his state and constituents rises above personal or party considerations, all will be safe.....We praise those who have come up to the help of the people against the mighty, who have said to the all grasping central power at Washington—'hitherto mayst thou come, but no farther.' Pennsylvania claims certain State Rights, which hence forward shall not only exist in name but in practice. Too long has Pennsylvania been enthralled, cajoled and injured." But from his own party, Penrose received scant approval. The defence was repudiated by many Democrats in Perry and other counties in which meetings had declared the new bank unconstitutional.[44] A meeting of the citizens of North

Penrose receives the support of Bank papers

[43] The American Volunteer, February 18, 1836; March 3, 1836.

[44] The Whig, Chambersburg, March 18, 1836; Pennsylvania Reporter and State Journal, April 15, 1836.

Middletown repudiated Charles B. Penrose as having betrayed his eonstituents and requested him to resign his seat in the Pennsylvania Senate as unworthy the confidenee of Demoeratie Republieans. On July 30, 1836, Penrose's eonstituents were to give him a dinner at the Carlisle Barraeks, "to afford him an opportunity to explain the Why and Beeause he voted for the Bank." Aeeording to a Whig paper a thousand persons were present at the meeting; either this statement was exaggerated or a Demoeratic print regarded the number as "almost no one." Demoeratie publieations eontinued to the end of the year to "eome out against Penrose for his "base treaehery to the party and its principles, and his servile adherenee to the United States Bank." A quotation from a Carlisle paper will conelude the matter: "The honest yeomen of Cumberland County—wish only the prostration of sueh dietation as C. B. Penrose has attempted to introduee. Our whole state has been convulsed from the Delaware to the Ohio by the vain and presumptuous attempt of a few individuals amongst whom C. B. Penrose is the *head and front,* to trample the rights of the people under foot."

Penrose repudiated by his own constituents

Penrose's position in opposing the United States Bank and supporting the state bank was unusual; other Demoeratie politicians thought it was only eonsistent to oppose the new bank as rigorously as they had opposed the national bank. One editor wrote: "The state bank is more dangerous than the United States Bank. This bank will regulate the whole monied interest of the state. The people, the merehants and the farmers will be ruined. In a few years the direetors of the Mammoth Bank may possess all of Pennsylvania. All this ean be done by a bank possessing $35,000,000. I would as soon have believed that the Legislature would sell us to Nieholas, the autoerat of Russia, as to Nieholas, the autoerat of all the banks." As the old bank, before it, the Pennsylvania Bank was attaeked as a "foreign monopoly" owned by the aristocrats of Europe, sueh as the Baring

Brothers. Francis J. Harper spoke in the Pennsylvania Senate against the Charter of the United States Bank of Pennsylvania saying: "The state will become a suppliant at the door of a heartless child of her own nurture. The deed is done, and Pennsylvania is bound to the car of a monied monopoly for near a third of a century." (The bank was chartered for thirty years). Politicians attempted to associate the new bank as closely as possible with the United States Bank. "The American Volunteer" maintained: the same individuals control the affairs of the new United States Bank of Pennsylvania as did the old United States Bank. The capital is the same ($35,000,000). "Every subject of public utility in republican Pennsylvania depends upon the will and wish of the U. States Bank;" "are the good people of this Commonwealth prepared to bow down in humble servility at the feet of this tyrant, that is far more dangerous to our liberties, than would be the combined armies of all the despots of Europe? We will prostrate this aristocratic institution. The American Eagle that yet soars proudly aloft on the Star Spangled Banner shall not couch before the Lion of England."

The assembly and the senate had passed the bill in spite of a strong popular opposition. Petitions and remonstrances by the score from meetings throughout the state were introduced during the first months of the year. In thirty days, no less than seventy remonstrances were presented in the state senate to show that citizen meetings were opposed to what they called the "charter of the United States Bank."

The new Bank, as the old, receives support from the National Republicans

But sentiment was divided. Opposition petitions came largely from the counties of Huntingdon, Fayette, Northumberland, York, Juniata and Westmoreland. Petitions in support of the Bank came from the counties of Adams and Philadelphia. The supporters of a Charter urged the state's need of the $2,000,000 bonus, which the new bank would pay. A leading Whig (National Republican) editor thus presents the matter:

"Either the bank must be chartered by Pennsylvania for a bonus to complete her great system of improvements without taxing the people, or the bank will be chartered by some other state, and we shall lose the bonus, and the means of carrying on the public improvements. The Bank will be chartered, and Pennsylvania has only to decide whether she will charter it or not." "Bank notes are preferable even to 'Jackson gold.' Shall Pennsylvania be silly enough to reject the Bank Charter, keep on the state taxes, let the school system struggle along the best way it can and go on borrowing money to prosecute her public improvements, while Maryland or New York, rejoicing at our folly, grants the Bank a charter? We thank our sister states in Congress assembled for their kindness in relinquishing all claims to the Monster after it was caught; they shall see it gratis forever in our canals, railroads, and turnpikes, and public schools. The state of Pennsylvania assisted to catch the Monster that she might tame it and make of it a profitable pet." Whig papers ascribed to political motives the persistent opposition to the Bank, national, or state.[45] A Chambersburg paper wrote: The people are driven to oppose the recharter of the Bank to please General Jackson and his Kitchen Cabinet. They are subservient to their master, the Prince of Kinderhook.[46] A person signing himself, "A Whig," wrote to Van Buren urging him to advocate a new United States Bank and thus secure the vote of at least one-half of the Whigs.

[45] The arguments against the Bank which appeared in the public press were calculated to appeal to the emotions rather than to reason, or to the intellect. But this fact is not surprising when we reflect that the whole of he newspaper literature of the day was of that type. This was especially true of the prints which belonged to the western parts of the state. These sheets abound in ultra emotional tales, and morbid articles. Political discussions could not hope to escape entirely the literary taint of the times.

[46] The American Volunteer, April 17, August 18; February 18, March 3, 1836; The Whig, August 12, January 29, February 12, 1836.

But the issue was so important politically that a studied politician could not proceed with too great caution. Even over zealous leaders had lost party support through supposed lukewarmness on the vital subject. Earlier it has been noted that Wolf by his apparent uncertainty brought down upon himself the ire of a large number of his own party. The effect of such dissatisfaction in causing the Democrats to look elsewhere for a gubernatorial candidate and its general effect upon the party fortunes of the Democrats and of the Whigs will now be considered.

CHAPTER III

Whig Coalition and Democratic Schism

Effect of the Bank war

Jackson's relentless course in destroying the Bank served to alienate many otherwise "reliant Jacksonites." Many a Democrat, while still adhering to the party, repudiated the strenuous policy of the Dictator. Such a group of disaffected Democrats were by no means insignificant. They seem to have been especially numerous in Philadelphia, where they met frequently to follow the paradoxical course of supporting the Democratic party while denouncing Jackson and upholding the Bank. We have seen that under the proud name of Independent-Democrats, they served to weaken the power of the Democratic machine in the state. By their negative action, they constituted an element of strength on which the National Republicans counted in subsequent elections. Agreement in sentiment led to agreement in action, and in the autumn of 1833 both party groups were meeting together in the wards of Philadelphia to protest against "the state of things at Washington." Later, they went so far as to unite in forming their city and county tickets. In Southwark, a large joint assemblage instructed their delegates to nominate for Congress none but a decided Anti-Jackson man. Thus, certain Democrats were strengthening the opposition at the expense of their own party.

Democrats secede from their party

Elements of opposition to Jackson

Another and smaller group which indirectly aided the National-Republican cause were the "Sons of Hibernia." The "Nationals" made bids for the Irish vote, insisting that "Van-Buren, being a Dutchman, scorned an Irishman." "The United States Gazette" spoke of the union of the Democratic-Anti-

Jackson and Irishmen's Ticket, and declared that in the elections of 1832, "the Naturalized Irishmen came and lent their numbers and their votes to the good cause of Anti-Jacksonism." [1]

Later, other Democrats broke away from their party and formed an insignificant but growing element which their enemies designated as "the Priest party." In the spring of 1835, we hear of their holding a meeting of their own, "about seven miles from Allentown in the neighborhood of Fogels." Though the Anti-Catholic feeling as manifested in politics is of later date, it may be noted that the use of the name, American Party, appears as early as in the year 1835, when a small group of Anti-Jacksonites decreed that "the friends of the Bleeding Constitution" should be called the "American Party." "Malcontents" was the name used by Jacksonians to designate these heterogeneous elements which by opposing Jackson and subsequently Van-Buren substantially furthered National-Republican ambitions. To absorb the Malcontents, and by presenting a united front, break the Democratic hold in Pennsylvania became the ambition of National-Republican leaders. Undying hostility to the Despot and his heir furnished the one bond of union. [2]

Another and far more important group which directly aided the "Nationals" in their fight against Jacksonianism may be recognized in the Anti-Masons. To encourage the attempt at union with Anti-Masonry, the Nationals had before them the example of a neighboring state. According to "The Bucks County Intelligencer," "In New York, Anti-Masonry entered into a compromise with the National-Republicans, the one great point of harmony being the defeat of Jackson. The Anti-Masons agreed to support Clay for the Presidency, and the National Republicans to aid in securing to the Anti-Masons their principle

The Anti-masons at first repel National Republican overtures

[1] The United States Gazette, September 27, 1833; September 28, 1832.

[2] Mss., Wolf, from John Wilson, Allentown, April 29, 1835; Democratic State Journal, June 27, 1835.

state candidates.'' The editor suggests—''Why cannot the same arrangement be effected in Pennsylvania?'' If such an arrangement was long delayed, the fault cannot be ascribed to the National-Republicans. They had early made overtures to the Anti-Masons and even suggested the formation in common of state and county tickets. In 1832, their spirit of conciliation reached the extent of withdrawing their own ticket and adopting the Anti-Jackson ticket, which was ''in plain words the Anti-Masonic ticket.'' In 1834, in various parts of the state, amalgamation meetings were held at which the Nationals and the Antis united in nominating local candidates. The realization of complete amalgamation was the aim and object of National Republican policy, and to this end party leaders bent their efforts.

For some time their overtures met with cold response, and by the more rigidly inclined of the Anits were definitely repelled. Proud of its influence, the Anti-Masonic party was determined to preserve its peculiar identity. As Anti-Masons, the party had increased in strength; Anti-Masonic it would remain. Prominent leaders regarded the primal cause—the raison d'être—of the party as too sacred to bear submerging in any rising Anti-Jackson coalition. Thaddeus Stevens, ever mindful of the original aim of his party, directed all his energies toward the extinction of Masonry. In December (1834), he introduced into the legislature resolutions which charged Masonry with being Anti-Republican, with creating secret orders of nobility in violation of the spirit of our constitution, with forming secret treaties with other Masonic Powers, with preventing the wholesome enactment and due administration of laws, and finally with corrupting our legislative halls and our courts of justice. The next day, Stevens presented a petition from Adams County for an investigation into the evils of Free Masonry, and at the same time introduced a resolution to the effect that the committee on the Judiciary system be instructed to bring in a bill effectually to sup-

press and prohibit the administering and reception of Masonic Odd Fellows and all secret extra judicial oaths. For some time Anti-Masons stressed to the complete exclusion of all other ideas, their fanatic antagonism to Free Masonry. Thus they persisted in a position of political isolation. Many, both in and out of the party realized that Anti-Masons "acted foolishly in making their principles so strictly a political test." Democrats could at this time (the spring of 1831) rejoice that "The Antis stand alone and will hereafter continue to do so." In the course of two years, while the Nationals claimed that they had united with the Antis, the Democrats ridiculed the idea. There was a foundation of fact in Democratic ridicule. Large groups of Antis continued to favor separate action. A coterie of Anti-Masonic citizens in Union County went so far as to pass these resolutions: "We will not be styled by any other name than Anti-Mason. We will support no man for office who is not a thorough going Political Anti-Mason. At all township meetings, no delegates shall be appointed who are not Anti-Masons." In a Chester County gathering, the Anti-Masons gave expression to similar sentiments, ignoring all thought of union or conciliation with other Anti-Jackson groups. This separist element among the Antis took the haughty stand that "National Republicans should be received into the party only as men who had ceased to be National Republicans." This uncompromising group, furthermore, regarded amalgamation with the Nationals as a sacrifice of principle to expediency. In their opinion, the all important undertaking—the destruction of Masonry—should not be clouded by other issues.

Others in the party of more practical bent realized early in 1834, that alone Anti-Masonry was not strong enough to succeed in the approaching elections. Such leaders, according to Democratic estimates "never cared a fig for Anti-Masonry further than as they supposed it might be used to their advantage."

Their advanees met with much encouragement from the National Republiean eamp where compromise was the order of the day. And who could better achieve the needed compromise than their own party leader, Clay? As early as 1831, he saw the possibilities of utilizing the new party. He thought that if the canvass in Pennsylvania should be conducted in a eoneiliatory manner by National Republicans toward the Antis they in turn would come to the support of the Nationals in the fall and help defeat the Jaekson party. He said: "The policy of the Antis is to foree us into their support. Ours should be to win them to ours." In Pennsylvania, we are the strongest party. "We ought to draw them to us, instead of being drawn to them. They and we agree as to everything the general government ean or ought to do. We differ only about Masonry respecting which the general government has nothing to do." A few newspapers in the southeastern quarter of the state supported the idea and urged the amalgamation of their party with the Nationals. They advised Antis as a point of honor, "to make the noblest personal sacrifiees—not of feelings only, but of Men and Party." At the same time "amalgamation meetings" recommended that the Anti-Masonic ticket be formed with a view to eompromise and eoneiliation. [3]

Compromise and coalition

A new name for the amalgamated party

And in the proposed eoalition, the one common bond of union would be opposition to "exeeutive usurpation." Jackson had asserted and in the eyes of his enemies had abused the exeeutive prerogative. The heterogeneous elements whieh championed the disregarded national legislative might well claim the name "Whig." They eould not be known permanently as the Anti-Jaekson party. Their enemies called them The All-Sorts-Party. Once again as in 1828, Anti-Jacksonites were seeking a

[3] Bucks County Intelligencer, October 1, 1832; Chester County Democrat, December 10, 1834; August 5, November 4, June 3, 1834; United States Gazette, September 1, 1832; Mss., Jackson, March 22, 1831; Mss., Van-Buren, December 5, 1832; Colton, Clay to Johnston, July 23, 1831.

party name. Once more, the Democrats referred to them scathingly as Federalists. It was the old tale of 1828; the National Republicans were living over again their historic struggle to found a party name. They used the name Whig as early as in the year 1832, although they did not secure general acceptance for the title until a few years later. In September, 1832, we find the Anti-Jackson men calling themselves Whigs and their opponents Tories. A Philadelphia editor writes: "A Whig in our times is one who appreciates and loves the independence gained by our fathers and cherishes the *institutions*, which have been grafted on it: the Whig of 1776 fought to acquire freedom; the Whig of the present time labours to preserve them.....A *tory* in our times is one who is in alliance with a party that would sacrifice our Union and our institutions (the fruits of our independence). Where are the Whigs and Tories of the present day? Which of the two parties is labouring to preserve our institutions, and which is employed in destroying them? Who is it that has made a fearful onset on the Judiciary? Who has trampled on the rights of the Senate? The men who follow in the support of Jackson are no more Whigs than those who opposed our fathers in their struggles for independence.....Wherever you see the banner of Jacksonism rely upon it there is Toryism." The name, Tory, was seldom at any time applied to the Democratic party; but the name Whig was shortly afterwards brought into general use to designate the slowly amalgamating elements of Jacksonian opposition. In 1834, a Pittsburg leader declared: National Republicans, Seceding Jacksonites, Anti-Masons, we stand indifferent between you. Our party—the Whig Party—is composed of many of you all. The name Whig represented a choice at once fitting and wise: The Whigs sympathized with the legislative in its struggle against the executive. Secondly, the name was replete with the glorious associations of revolutionary days.

Significance of the name, "Whig"

It was the part of Democratic propaganda to discredit this well chosen title, to discourage the Anti-Masons from entering further into alliance with the National Republicans, and thirdly, to attempt to bring back to the Democratic fold the disaffected elements of that political persuasion.

Jealousy of the Democrats

Jacksonians dreaded the thoughts of their enemies uniting under a common title. According to "The Pennsylvanian," a Democratic Town Meeting in Philadelphia resolved to call the opposition by their true name of Federalists, who have called themselves Federal-Republicans, Independent Democrats, Whigs, Democratic Whigs." An address to a Democratic meeting in the same city concluded: "We cannot rely on the professions of a party, which changes its name and political creed and which has appeared in the political arena under the name of National Republicans, Independent-Democrats, Bank men and now Whigs.

The name "Whig" irritated Democratic politicians for the further reason that it signified the rallying of Anti-Jackson forces. To disrupt the opposing coalition in the making, and thus avert disaster was the aim of all true Jacksonites. Their plan was to discourage Anti-Masonic acquiescence by ridiculing Whig overtures. They claimed that the crafty Whigs were attempting to unite with the Antis, only in order to put them out of the way in the next presidential election. Their prints warned Antis that as sure as the Whig combination would be effected so sure would Anti-Masonry go down to the dust. They accused the Antis of abandoning principles for partisan politics; they refused even to acknowledge that the loosest sort of a union existed between the Anti-Masons and the Whigs proper. But ridicule and denial were idle in the face of fact. Jacksonian opposition was slowly but surely organizing.

The realization that a coalition was threatening prompted Jacksonians to seek to strengthen their own forces before the impending election. Colonel Page confessed to Buchanan: "In

my opinion the party never stood in greater danger than it does now. Every combination will be brought to bear against it. We must be united or fail."[4] The Democrats now put forth positive efforts to strengthen their own position in the state. The matter which was then attracting most notice in a political way was the election of a United States Senator to succeed George M. Dallas. The difficulty which the Democrats experienced in choosing a candidate revealed the fact that the party was divided in its counsels. In the legislature, thirty unsuccessful ballots were taken, and still the party had not united on any one candidate. One faction supported McKean, another Muhlenberg, and neither would yield to the other. To settle the matter a few party leaders suggested the propriety of dropping both of these candidates and of uniting on James Buchanan. The proposition met with hearty accord. The newspapers took up the issue, and several mentioned Buchanan as "the proper man." At public meetings his name was acclaimed with enthusiasm. Thus encouraged, he wrote to Jackson in January, 1834, "If the election for Senator were now to take place, I think I should succeed without difficulty." From York County, Buchanan was thus assured: "I cannot think you have much to fear from Dallas. He declined being a candidate for re-election when he thought there was danger of defeat and I cannot but believe the party will remember him for it; your friends ought to bear that in mind and make use of it. There are so many candidates of the party in the field that the reporters cannot come out openly for any one."

The election of Buchanan as United States Senator

Meantime the opposition had presented their candidates. The Anti-Masons and the National-Republicans supported respectively Rush and Sergeant. Had they united, they might

[4] United States Gazette, September 25, 1832; Konkle, Life of Thomas Williams; The Pennsylvanian, October 19, 1831; June 27, 1831; Chester County Democrat, July 15, 1834; September 9, 1834; The Pennsylvanian, July 5, 1834; Mss., Buchanan, January 22, 1834.

have sueeeeded; but the Antis would not vote for Sergeant. In addition to the support of the Nationals, Sergeant enjoyed also that of the Independent Democrats, who held meetings on October eighth in various parts of Philadelphia and elsewhere for the purpose of arranging to secure the election of their favored leader. [5]

In December, 1834, the legislature took four ballots for senator. The concluding vote elected Buchanan, who received sixty-six out of one hundred and thirty votes—the total number cast. One lone vote was cast for Sutherland. From all parts of the state congratulations poured in approving of the choice of a "true blue Jacksonian." Charles B. Penrose and other political friends in a joint letter congratulated the senator elect. They rejoiced that he was "the friend of the state and national executives." Penrose's congratulatory letter forms an amusing contrast to his relations with Buchanan during the succeeding senatorial contest in 1836. Buchanan pictures the situation to Van Buren: "The renegades (Penrose and Dickey) . . . . . would prefer any person to me unless it be the Devil or George M. Dallas." [6]

The elections of 1834

The elections of 1834 showed that the Democrats were still holding their own against all elements of opposition. To the twenty-fourth congress, the state returned seventeen Jackson men and eleven Anti-Jackson men. In the state senate, the Democrats were to have twenty-five members (a gain of three over

[5] Chester County Democrat, July 19, 1834; Moore, Buchanan to Jackson, January 18, 1834; Mss., Buchanan, from W. F. Franklin, York, November 25, 1834; Backman to Buchanan, Lancaster, March 31, 1833; Mss., Randolph Clay to Buchanan, Philadlephia, March 21, 1833; United States Gazette, October 2, 1833.

[6] Mss., Van Buren, December 6, 1834; Mss., Buchanan, from J. A. Sterrit, December 30, 1834; from R. Stranke, December 6, 1834; from Derns, Read, Charles B. Penrose, Burden, etc., Harrisburg, December 8, 1834; Mss., Van Buren, from Buchanan, November 18, 1836.

the previous year), as against eight of the opposition; to the Assembly, the Democrats had elected sixty-two members, the opposition only thirty-eight. Thus the Democratic majority in joint ballot would reach forty-one. The Democrats had large majorities in the seventh, eighth and ninth Congressional districts, comprising among others the counties of Northampton, Pike, Wayne, Schuylkill and Lehigh. The Democratic ticket had been especially strong in the counties of Philadelphia, Berks, Northampton and Westmoreland. If the majorities in these counties, comments a Democratic daily, had been properly distributed among those counties in which the Whigs and Antis had majorities, they would have been sufficient to defeat every Anti-Jackson candidate.

Although defeated, the Whigs had gained in strength. In the state legislature, they were steadily increasing their number. In the assembly, they could claim a gain of fifteen members over the previous year. In the state senate, the advance was not so conspicuous; their number rose from seven to eight. Whig candidates had been especially successful in Philadelphia city where they had majorities in thirteen of the fifteen wards. Even a Democrat, Richard Rush, conceded that "The Whigs were strong in the central part of the city (the Chestnut Street part)." At the northern and southern ends of the city, the Democrats were generally successful. The doubtful character of the political complexion of the city gave rise to a "horrible outrage:" a riot occurred in Moyamensing in front of the polls; here the Jackson men had erected a hickory pole and a large wooden statue in honour of the soldier president. Envious and spoiling for a fight, the jubilant Whigs burned down the cherished emblems of Jacksonism. Enraged at the act of vandalism, the Jackson men began to throw sticks and stones at their opponents. By way of reprisal, the Whigs commenced a discharge of musketry from the windows of their headquarters opposite. As a result, fourteen

Electioneering outrage

Democrats were seriously hurt and one killed. To avenge th outrage, the Democrats in turn burned down the Whig insigni and destroyed the building which the Whigs were using a headquarters. The whole episode reflected great disgrace on th city and state. The next gubernatorial message alludes to th incident as an occurrence of a most "melancholy nature" b which an "unoffending and highly estimable citizen was de prived of his life; having been wantonly and basely stabbed b some reckless assassin."[7] In other parts of the state, the Whig did not celebrate victory with such reckless enthusiasm. The were generally successful in the southeast; the returns from th fourth congressional district, comprising the counties of Lancas ter, Chester and Delaware, revealed large Anti-Masonic majori ties; in Adams County, Thaddeus Stevens and his colleague wo majorities of three hundred and thirty-seven, and four hundre and ninety-seven respectively against their Democratic oppon ents. The Democrats accused the Whigs of utilizing the votes o the negroes—"Black Whigs" (sic) who were even in thes earlier days "fit instruments of corruption." According to Democratic account, "no sooner did any of them show a dispo sition to vote against Massa Clay and Misses Bank, than he wa threatened with violence by her more obsequious fellow slaves."

Whig successes

The Whig successes of this fall were sufficient to instil anxiety into Democratic ranks; "let us prepare to do better i '35," wrote a Democratic editor, "Anti-Masonry and Bankism cannot stand, they must go down, the people have willed it." The coalition, threatening to become more firmly cemented wa ominous of Democratic failure in coming campaigns. Another and greater omen of evil for the Democratic party in the elec

[7] Chester County Democrat, October 28, 1834; November 11, 1834; January 13, 1835; Mss., Van Buren, October 15, 1834, from Richard Rush June 6, January 22, February 3, July 2, October 31, 1834; Pennsylvania Archives, Vol. VI, page 185.

tion of 1835 was the threatening schism in their own party. We will first take a hurried glance at the dreaded activities of the coalitionists. Expectant Whigs emphasized with increasing fervor the necessity of suppressing the Masonry contention. Again coinciding with the Antis on the choice of a Gubernatorial candidate, they hoped that their colleagues in return would abandon their fanatic opposition to Masonry. A combination coterie at Harrisburg declared: "As Whigs without reference to political Masonry, we will yield our support to Joseph Ritner for governor. We cannot consent to become the instruments either directly or indirectly of strengthening the hopes of success of Van-Buren in Pennsylvania by bringing into the field another Whig candidate for Governor. We recommend to our Whig brethren throughout the commonwealth, to perfect an organization of the party in county conventions and township meetings, and not make a useless, expensive and abortive attempt to do it through the agency of a state convention. [8]

Preparations for the gubernatorial election of 1835

The Democrats felt otherwise. The state convention was to them all important. They little dreamed early in 1835 that it was destined indirectly to entail for the party schism and failure. Their regular party convention was to be held as was customary, on March fourth at Harrisburg. Electioneering was active more than a year before the election. The first month of the new year (1834) had scarcely commenced when certain prints began the advocacy of one candidate or another. While Whig sheets were united in support of their time honored leader, the Democrats failed to agree definitely on either one of two gubernatorial possibilities. Whereas some papers early promoted the nomination of Muhlenberg, others inclined toward Wolf, who now aspired to a third term. Traces of the Muhlenberg gubernatorial boom were long apparent. As early as the spring of

Rival candidates of the Democratic Party

[8] Chester County Democrat, October 28, 21, 1834; Chronicle of the Times, October 7, 1834; Bucks County Intelligencer, May 6, 1835.

1833 Buehanan learns from George Plitt that "Muhlenberg is one of the most upright, eorrect and unassuming men in the state; he is as firm as our hills and without a doubt will be our next Governor." Muhlenberg, being a native of Reading, received the support of Berks County. At Kutztown, a Fourth of July celebration in 1834 drank to the hope "that he be honored with the command of the ship, Pennsylvania, by the freemen in 1835." The county promised their native son "sueh a vote as will ring the death knell of Anti-Masonry, Federalism, Wigism (sic) or any other name the Bankites may choose to assume." The county spoke of its political signifieanee in flattering terms: "The eyes of the whole nation are upon Old Berks. As Old Berks goes, so goes Pennsylvania."

Electioneering was promoted through mass meetings, eelebrations, partisan editorials and committees of eorrespondenee. Democratic County meetings were held to instruct delegates for the state convention. The counties which supported the candi-

The Muhlenberg boom diverts support from Wolf

dacy of Muhlenberg were Mercer, Luzerne, Northumberland, Schuylkill and Cumberland Counties. Montgomery County was lukewarm. The Democratic meetings here elected three delegates supporting Muhlenberg, and one supporting Wolf. Though Wolf was not popular in this county, yet he was said to be more so than was Muhlenberg. Feeling for Wolf was strong in Erie, Indiana, Cambria, Mereer, Tioga, Philadelphia, York, Wayne and Pike Counties. In some localities support was divided. In Bradford "there was great difficulty in the meeting" and it was feared that two sets of delegates would be elected. But eventually the meeting instructed both delegates for Wolf. Late in 1834, Strickland, who had an intimate knowledge of the political complexion of every locality in the state, thus reassures Wolf: "Publie opinion in the North and West will have been so deeidedly and unequivocally expressed in favor of your re-nomination as to induce the restless spirits here (West Chester) to go

right enough.....Lancaster County will come out right, I would judge from the proceedings of the committee of correspondence in that county." Much of the opposition directed against Wolf arose from the fact that he was seeking a third term, instead of being content to retire. According to the Muhlenberg Democrats, two terms or six years for the office of Governor, was rather more in accordance with principles of Jeffersonian Democracy. In the second place, the opposing candidate enjoyed the advantage of being not so well known. For six years, Wolf's theories and practices had been exposed to the criticism of a party without appreciation, without gratitude. The third term aspirant was discredited, because he had adhered too tenaciously to the completion of certain projects which became the more unpopular according as they involved or threatened to involve the state in greater and greater debt. Wolf's position on the question of a national bank has been alluded to previously. [9]

Objections to Wolf as a candidate

A later and more urgent objection to the re-election of Wolf concerned the manner of his nomination. Early in the campaign, rumors circulated to the effect that Wolf would not be nominated at the convention of March fourth. Political leaders at Harrisburg felt that even if nominated, he certainly could not be elected, and his defeat would have the tragic effect of causing the state to lose her vote and influence in the next Presidential elections. Peter Petrikin informs Van Buren that "upon the nomination on Fourth of March next of Muhlenberg depends the success of your friends at the electoral election." Buchanan likewise was told by his political friends that the nomination of Governor Wolf for a third term is fraught with more danger

[9] Mss., Buchanan, from George Plitt, April 4, 1833; from J. W. B. Stinger, Norristown, January 5, 1835; Chronicle of the Times, July 22, 1834, October 7, 1834; Mss., Wolf, from Ward, Montrose, February 9, 1835, from Strickland, West Chester, December 25, 1834.

than we had supposed. Should he be nominated and defeated the consequences would be ruinous for the election of 1836. We have arrived at the conclusion that it is due to the party to promote the nomination of Muhlenberg.[10] The party realized that it was "in a critical position in Pennsylvania." Clever manoeuvering would be necessary to ensure the nomination of Muhlenberg. Once more as in the contest of 1829, the power of Sutherland to sway the nominating convention was recognized. It was well known that his friendship for Wolf was not very sincere. Therefore the Muhlenberg advocates saw the necessity of winning him over. Petriken tells Van Buren: "The vote at the convention will be a close one as it now stands, but if Dr. Sutherland was secured there would not be a shadow of doubt. Whichever way he casts the balance, the nomination will go.

Wolf adherents, on the other hand, predicted that Muhlenberg's strength in the convention on the fourth of March would not exceed thirty votes, and that the city of Philadelphia would instruct for Wolf. They claimed that much of the talk about the doubts of Wolf's election were gotten up to prevent his nomination. Toward the end of January, they still felt that Wolf's nomination was beyond all question. Buchanan hears that "Muhlenberg is lowering every day in the estimation of the steady Democracy of the state."[11]

"The Pennsylvanian"—the old Democratic organ of Phila-

[10] Mss., Buchanan, from A. C. Ramsey, York, December 21, 1834; from George Plitt, Harrisburg, December 26, 1834; from David P. December 28, 1834; Mss., Van Buren, from Peter Petrikin, February 11, 1835; Mss., Buchanan, from Robinson, Lynch, and C. J. Roberts, Pittsburg, January 7, 1835.

[11] Mss., Buchanan
a—from John D., Harrisburg, January 9, 1835;
b—from Petrikin, February 11, 1835;
c—from Harrisburg, January 10, 1835;
d—from Stirgen, Norristown, January 12, 1835;
e—from J. Mitchell, Harrisburg, January 6, 1835.

delphia—came in for a fair share of abuse from its own party. Its course was a vacillating one; at one time it lent its energies in support of Wolf, only later to champion the candidacy of Muhlenberg. In this way, the paper did more harm than good. And thus the party remained divided in its support of either candidate. While one party worker toured Western Pennsylvania to procure the election of delegates favorable to Muhlenberg, delegates were being elected in the east in favor of Wolf. It was recognized that such a course was "the height of impolicy, and ought to be corrected, or the consequences would be fraught with mischief." As was foreseen, mischief was the result; there was more than a meagre minority against Wolf, although the "savants" had felt otherwise.[12]

Wolf's friends regarded the attempt to nominate Muhlenberg as an intrigue and condemned those who suported the scheme with the name "Muhleys." The easy solution advocated by Wolf's faithful following was the elimination of their opponent. They invited Muhlenberg to withdraw from the contest by addressing a strong letter to the convention—declining the nomination. They said that if Muhlenberg would not comply with this request, the result would be the downfall of The People's Party, and "the triumph of the Whigs under some flag, White, Black or Green—over Van Buren." But Muhlenberg remained in dignified retirement awaiting the result of the approaching convention. As was foreshadowed, this convention was a fiasco. The delegates instructed to support Wolf would not yield to the Muhlenberg adherents. All calmly agreed to disagree. By a vote of fifty-one to forty-one, they dissolved the

The abortive convention of March fourth

[12] Mss., Buchanan
a—from Hugh Maxwell, Lancaster, December 26, 1834;
b—from John Reynolds, Lancaster, December 28, 1834;
c—from Benj. Mifflin, Philadelphia, December 20, 1834;
d—from W. B. Mitchell, Lancaster, January 25, 1835;
e—from J. R. Montgomery, Lancaster, January 28, 1835.

convention, resolving to refer the whole matter back to the people. They set April 27 as the day on which new delegates should be chosen to meet at a second convention to be held at Lewistown early in May.[13] Such was the agreement reached by the abortive convention. The Muhlenberg delegates then returned home to promote their prospects for the May convention. The Wolf delegates remained in Harrisburg. Impatient of delay and faithless to the general agreement of March fourth, they rallied their forces and on the night of March sixth held a caucus, and in the morning formed a convention in which they nominated Wolf.[14]

The caucus of March sixth

The Muhlenbergers who had looked forward to a general party convention on May sixth, received with dismay the news of the stolen meeting. Scathingly they denounced it as a caucus.[15] Charles B. Penrose predicted that Wolf could not be elected because of his "irregular caucus nomination." He told Buchanan that fifty papers were out against it. The seventh of March caucus was everywhere bitterly attacked, for had it not "virtually pronounced the people unfit for self government?" It had left totally unrepresented eighteen of the fifty-two counties. The fourth of March convention, on the contrary, had referred the choice of a candidate back to the people and the friends of the Lewistown convention had promised a like willingness to trust the people. Democratic county meetings expressed freely their sentiment in regard to the "caucus." Adams County regarded as a sham the nomination of Wolf after the convention had been dissolved. Northumberland County

[13] Mss., Wolf, from Ward, Montrose, January 9, 1835; Mss., Van Buren, Harrisburg, February 23, 1835; Mss., Buchanan, from Croft, G. W., Harrisburg, March 7, 1835; Bucks County Intelligencer, March 11, 1835.

[14] Democratic State Journal, April 28, 1835; July 25, 1835; Mss., Van-Buren, from Petrikin, Harrisburg, March 8, 1835.

[15] For an appreciation of the significance of the caucus in Pennsylvania history, see the article by Ostrogorki in the American Historical Review. for January, 1900, and that by J. S. Walton, in the same magazine of January, 1897.

resolved that the reference back to the people after the dissolution of the convention was a wise, patriotic and democratic measure. A Union County meeting resolved that Wolf was nominated by a mere caucus of his office holders. Muhlenberg Democrats declared that the name Wolf had now "become another word for Caucussing." A few members of the party, formerly followers of Wolf felt that they could no longer support their candidate unless he were nominated by the Lewistown convention. [16]

If even a Wolfite could feel impelled to support the Lewistown convention, which represented the reference of the whole question to the people, it is easy to guess the enthusiasm of the supporters of the injured candidate. At Reading and at other places where Muhlenberg was favored, the "peoples' convention" idea was upheld. In accordance with the agreement of the abortive convention, Democratic meetings were once more held throughout the state to elect delegates to the Lewistown Convention. Cumberland County sent as one of its delegates C. B. Penrose. Wolfites complained that a few of these meetings were only small county gatherings instead of regular delegate meetings as directed by the Fourth of March Convention. In the Allentown meeting, there was an attempt to conciliate the two factions. A Wolf agent attempted to prevent the "Muhlies" from sending delegates to Lewistown; but utterly failed. In Bradford and adjoining counties there were "scarcely enough of the friends of Muhlenberg to form a corporals' guard." "They attempted to get up a meeting at Towanda and could get but six persons inside the railing." Wayne County was as strong for Wolf as in 1832. They cherished the hope that after the Lewistown convention they would hear no more talk about division, for then the

[16] Mss., Buchanan, from C. B. Penrose, March 30, 1835, March 15, 1835; Democratic State Journal, July 25, April 25, April 11, September 26, 1835; Mss., Wolf, from Wilson, September 17, 1835.

field would be abandoned to the candidate of the people. They could then say: "The fiat of the people has gone forth, and no man need hereafter hope to govern Pennsylvania for three terms."

The Lewistown convention of May sixth

The Lewistown Convention met May sixth, 1835; one hundred and twenty-one of the delegates voted for Muhlenberg of Berks County and he was declared unanimously nominated as the Democratic candidate. A candidate for Governor had now been fairly nominated. A full delegation to the convention had been appointed in every representative and senatorial district in the state excepting in Indiana and Jefferson.[17]

And yet Muhlenberg was no sooner nominated than his opponents besieged him with letters, urging him to withdraw. To such a request from Buchanan, Muhlenberg replied: "I am placed in nomination, my name cannot be withdrawn; Governor Wolf's prospects of success are utterly hopeless.....If the party should be destroyed and Ritner placed in the chair, the blame cannot rest upon my friends." The regular nomination of Muhlenberg, instead of healing, served only to aggravate the already existing schism. The split in the party was now obvious. Each faction urged the support of its own candidate and advised the withdrawal of the opposing impostor. Each faction explained the situation to party leaders in Washington, hoping for definite action from headquarters. Penrose laments the situation because the failure of Wolf's election would place in the hands of the Anti-Masons a vast amount of power. One unbiased Democratic newspaper wished to support the candidate, "be it Wolf or Muhlenberg, who could command the highest number of votes." Later, however, the same paper decided there was "no

[17] Democratic State Journal, April 18, 1835, May 11, 16, 2, 1835; Mss., Wolf, from Wilson, April 29, 1835; from Ward, April 28, 1835; Mss., Buchanan, from Petriken, Harrisburg, March 14, 1835.

possible chance for Muhlenberg."[18] The Muhlenberg faction was by no means insignificant. Neither faction could be ignored by the other. Buchanan states the situation after his own non-committal fashion: "I am much mistaken if the mass of the Democratic party in this state is not with Wolf.....Still there is a highly respectable portion of it in favor of Muhlenberg. Throughout the summer of 1835, both factions labored to promote the prospects of their respective candidates. Wolf was said to have bestowed his patronage lavishly upon the conductors of the press. One of his party workers "bought up a German paper in Allentown with the bribe of an appointment provided he would support the Fourth of March Convention."

Democratic schism aggravated

Each candidate was abused on religious grounds. Muhlenberg was accused of having been a minister of the Gospel, and Wolfites talked about the union of church and state. "The Muhlies," in turn, accused Wolf of being implicated in an intrigute to ensure the Catholic vote. According to a newspaper account, Wolf's chances for election were furthered through the exertions of a Catholic priest, Curran, who rode the canal for weeks, compelling the members of his Church to vote for Wolf, threatening those who were likely to prove recreant with the terrors of the church. Curran, the paper claimed, was scheduled to visit before the election and in behalf of Wolf, every Western county in which there were Catholics. As in previous campaigns, Wolf toured the state. The opposing faction spoke of his "traveling cabinet" which "perambulated the state from one end to the other."

While Wolf and his friends toured the state, Muhlenberg remained quietly at home—the idolized son of Berks. A toast at a large celebration in this county, was in these words: "Let us

[18] Mss., Buchanan, from R. Vaux, Philadelphia, March 21, 1835; from Muhlenberg, Reading, March 24, 1835; Mss., Van Buren, March 15, 1835; "American Volunteer," October 8, 1835.

unite to our good shepherd, Muhlenberg, for the Wolf is close at hand.'' Confidently, the people of Berks (sic) sang:''

''Muhlenberg ist der rechte Mann,
Welchen das Ruder fuehren Kann.''

At the same time they ridiculed Joseph Ritner as the ''sanco Banza'' (sic) of Anti-Masonry. [19]

With the opposition hopelessly divided, Ritner was destined to win. Robert Vaux writes to Buchanan from Philadelphia: ''I think it quite probable that the Whigs and the all-sorts-party to boot, will succeed with their candidate. What glorious consolation will it be for the champions of Muhlenberg and the forces of Wolf by a vile division of their strength to witness some such being as Joseph Ritner elevated to the office of Governor of Pennsylvania upon the ruins of the Republican party.'' Buchanan, in turn, warns Van Buren that the division in the Democratic Party would make Ritner Governor. Stevens thus characterized the three candidates: Wolf is the candidate of the Masons, Muhlenberg of New York, and Ritner of the Salvationists. In scorn, Democrats persisted in declaring Ritner and Anti-Masonry were but instruments in the hands of the Whigs for destroying the Democracy of the state. [20]

Ritner, an easy victor

The result of the election was obvious. Circumstances made Ritner an easy victor; he was elected by a large majority; Muhlenberg received the lowest vote of all. [21] Thus through alliance and through disaffection in the Democratic ranks, the Whigs and the friends of Political Anti-Masonry had scored a great Victory, and could well congratulate themselves.

The results of the Democratic schism were far reaching.

[19] Mss., Van Buren, May 21, 1835; Democratic State Journal, July 11, August 22, September 19, October 3, 1835; Mss., Wolf, from John Wilson, Allentown, April 29, 1835; Chronicle of the Times, July 21, 1835.

[20] Mss., Buchanan, from Robert Vaux, Philadelphia, February 18, 1835; Moore, Buchanan, May 21, 1835; Democratic State Journal, August 1, 1835.

[21] Cf. Appendix B.

The state party convention of March fourth had had as one of its functions the election of delegates for the national convention, which was to convene in Baltimore. The abortive convention elected no delegates. The "*caccusites*" on March sixth elected one set of delegates, and the Lewistown convention another set. Much agitation arose as to which of the two sets of delegates would be admitted to the Baltimore convention. The Lewistown delegates claimed priority inasmuch as one hundred and twenty-four members were present in their convention and only eighty-four had met in the caucus at Harrisburg. The situation was saved by the fact that both sets of delegates being favorable to the nomination of Van Buren were admitted without question. "The Bucks County Intelligencer" insisted that the national convention had to nominate Van Buren as per orders from Washington. Thus, although divided in the choice of a governor, the Democrats of Pennsylvania united in support of a presidential candidate. The significance of the gubernatorial election in determining the national election of 1836 had been stressed again and again during the stormy campaign. The "Savants" had said that loss in the gubernatorial election would presage a Democratic national defeat in the following year. But Buchanan was more optimistic and farsighted; he realized that although the division in the Democratic Party would make Ritner Governor, yet such election would not seriously affect the presidential contest.

The significance of the Democratic schism

The election of Ritner stands out as the first great Whig triumph in Pennsylvania. It represents a crisis in the political fortunes of the state. Democratic control once shaken could never again be completely regained. Democrats might rally again on national and state candidates; but a new day was dawning; Pennsylvania was freeing herself gradually and surely from the dominance of the Democratic Party. [22]

[22] Democratic State Journal, October 17, 1835, May 30, June 13, May 16, October 31, 1835; Bucks County Intelligencer, May 20, 27, 1835; Moore, Buchanan to Van Buren, May 21, 1835; Mss., Buchanan, from Roberts Vaux, Saratoga Springs, August 11, 1835.

CHAPTER IV

The American System and Local Politics

The Whigs of Pennsylvania always maintained that their party stood for principles and not for men. The effect of their support of the National Bank in drawing adherents to their party, and consequently weakening the Democratic hold in the state has been noted. It shall be the province of this chapter to indicate the influence on Pennsylvania politics of another important economic problem, to inquire to what extent the "American System" may be identified with Whig aspirations, and the "Anti-American policy" with Jacksonianism, to indicate party alignments on questions affecting Pennsylvanian interests, to illustrate the part played by the policy of Protection and Internal Improvements in winning Whig supporters, to show the effect on public opinion of Jackson's reputed English-Southern leanings and to note the re-action produced by the well-timed nullification proclamation. The American System in its aspect as a policy of Internal Improvements receives special stress in the latter part of the chapter, which attempts to show to what extent the promise of better internal communications and the financing involved, influenced the politics of the state.

The American System in Whig literature

In 1828, National-Republicans boasted that "never was there a time when 'measures, not men' was more emphatically the order of the day." They liked to think that the people of Pennsylvania were "more interested in the success of the 'American System' than in making any particular individual President." Thus convinced, the party, as individuals and in local gatherings, decided to vote for no man who was not in favor of

the protection of American manufactures, and of the completion of Internal Improvements. In national and in local electioneering propaganda, the American System figured conspicuously in the campaign literature of the National-Republican Party. It was regarded as the issue which determined party alignments. In the summer of 1828, National Republicans used to say, "there are but two parties now: the friends of the American System, who are also the friends of the present administration, and the enemies of the American System." "The enemies have taken up General Jackson and Calhoun, and the other party support Adams and Rush." Just as they associated Adams, Clay and Rush with The American System, National Republicans accused Jackson of following what they termed an "Anti-American System"—of favoring a tariff policy which would redound to the advantage of England as against that of America, and of Pennsylvania in particular. At Doylestown, in the fall of 1828, Administration supporters asked: "Shall Pennsylvania support Jackson and his Anti-American policy, and remain hewers of wood and drawers of water to Great Britain, or give our suffrages to the present enlightened administration—the friends of the tariff and domestic manufactures, whose policy will establish a market for our produce?" In 1829, they pictured Clay with the American System and tariff on the one hand, arrayed against Calhoun, with Anti-tariff and the English System on the other hand. National-Republican papers called on the voters of the state to protect "the American System against the British System." A Whig editor took the dramatic stand never to "submit to British influence, for the mention of it arouses every spark of indignation in the composition of an American." Thus, through the tariff agitation, it came about that whereas Jacksonites praised their candidate, as the Hero of New Orleans, Whigs reviled him as the friend and protector of British interests. The Anti-American policy, Whigs claimed, would work the greatest

possible injury to Pennsylvania, for "with Jacksonism, The American System will perish, and with it the brightest hopes of Pennsylvania, with whose prosperity it is identified."

The American System identified with Pennsylvanian interests

Although Jackson's popularity in Pennsylvania carried the state for the Democratic ticket, the American System was in essence, if not in name, supported in one of its phases in almost every locality. Whigs, then, might well lament the fact that Pennsylvania, in supporting Jackson, had deserted her own vital interests. "We did hope," said the Norristown Herald, "that Pennsylvania, true to her principles and her interests would have thrown off the yoke of personal admiration which bound her to the car of General Jackson, and have been led by principle and not by a man." With more vehemence than logic, National Republicans declared "Jackson's friends think and pronounce Pennsylvania a parcel of thick sculled Germans, too stupid to know their own interests." While Democrats admitted they had supported their Hero without exactly knowing what they did want, National Republicans were instituting a regular propaganda by which campaign literature was distributed, and public speeches made expounding the glories accruing from such a policy as the American System. In newspapers and in pamphlets, in party meetings and in impromptu gatherings, National Republicans declared that it was to the advantage of Pennsylvania to sustain that system which by promoting manufactures and Internal Improvements secured a vast home market. It was their proud boast that their candidates would rise or fall on the American System as an issue. After the election of 1829, they declared that "Ritner never wavered in his support of Jackson provided he would remain the steady friend of the American System, which to Ritner was paramount to every other issue." In the years that followed, Whigs spoke of Domestic manufactures and Internal Improvements as the true foundation of lasting Independence. At their state convention in 1832, the dele-

gates from Dauphin County presented resolutions to the effect that "The American System cannot be abandoned." This sentiment was reiterated in Easton and in other sections of the state. Irish Anti-Jackson men at a formal gathering in Philadelphia in 1832 resolved that they had no confidence in the administration of the general government, believing that "Jackson's real design was to destroy American Manufactures and Internal Improvements." In the fall of 1832, the platform of all Anti-Jackson candidates avowed support of The American System; Anti Masonic meetings at Doylestown an delsewhere passed resolutions supporting Protection and Internal Improvements. Thus in local and in national elections throughout the state, advocacy of the American System remained the dominant note in Anti-Jackson campaign proceedings. [1]

If the National Republicans were positive in their support of the American System, the Democrats, it may be said, were lukewarm, indifferent, or at least not a unit on the question. They preferred to relegate the issue to the background of politics while uniting the party in their customary worship of the Old Hero. To the dismay of the Opposition, Jackson remained, at the opening of his second term, uncommitted on the subject of the American System. In disgust, National Republicans asked: "Is there a man from Maine to Florida who knows his (Jackson's) real sentiments, with respect to those great interests of our country—Internal Improvements and the Protection of Domestic Industry?" Clay, on the other hand, was eulogized by

The Democrats ignore the issue

[1] Pennsylvania Intelligencer, October 7, 1828, October 14, 21, 1828; Harrisburg Argus, May 24, February 9, October 31, 1828; Niles' Register, December 1, 1827, January 12, 1828; Allegheny Democrat, June 23, 1829; Norristown Herald, October 22, 1828; Mss., Buchanan, December 30, 1830; The Republican, Harrisburg, October 9, 1829; The Statesman, July 6, 1831; Political Pamphlets, 1832; United States Gazette, August 6, September 22, 1832; Bucks County Intelligencer, August 13, 1832.

his party as one who had "openly avowed and ably defended" his attitude on these subjects. [2]

In the western counties, the American System was emphasized in its Internal Improvement phase; in the Eastern Counties, the tariff aspect of the system was stressed. In the west, the American System represented "something that goes on rails." Pennsylvanians were to see Philadelphia connected with the West by an ingenious system of canals, railroads and portage. In the western and middle western counties this phase of the American System was emphasized almost exclusively. In the east, the tariff question provoked the greater interest.

In Philadelphia the System was defined as a protective tariff. Here, at a large National Republican meeting the Speaker said: "The American System I take to mean that system which encourages our infant manufactories (sic) with a view to enable them to compete with a powerful rival." [3]

Protection favoured especially in the East

In the eastern parts of the state, it had long been held that "the protecting hand of our government should be stretched over our infant manufactories (sic)," that "strong protective duties should be imposed on all articles, the like of which are produced or manufactured in the United States." [4]

In 1828, such a policy was associated with the National Republican Party; The Norristown Herald referred to Adams as

[2] Pamphlet—The National-Republican Convention, 1832.

[3] The Harrisburg Intelligencer, May 11, 1831; The United States Gazette, March 1, 1828.

[4] For instances of earlier and more formal demands of Pennsylvanians for Protective legislation, see American State Papers—Finance—Vol. II. In 1803, the gun manufactures in Lancaster petitioned Congress, praying that "the impost duty on arms will not be taken off; and that the encouragement of manufacturing them among ourselves, will be considered not only expedient, but necessary." (page 22). In the same year (1803), artisans and manufactures of Philadelphia declared in a petition to Congress that "the competition that the manufacturing citizens of the United States are by the laws of the country, obliged to sustain with the Manufacurers of a foreign country is.....unjust," and that "an infant manufacture must

the "open and avowed friend of the tariff," and termed the opposing candidate and his associates its enemies. Other National Republican papers regarded the election of 1828 as determining the question of the tariff, deciding that if Adams is elected the continuance of the tariff is secured. "The Franklin Repository," in 1828, declared: "The ostensible object of those who originated the opposition to the present administration was to effect a change in our Tariff system. Every day's experience confirms us in that opinion. Adams and the Tariff; Jackson and no Tariff is the question to be decided." National Republican platforms, national, state and local all promised much for the young industries of the state. The chief items for which they demanded protection in Pennsylvania were iron and wool.[5] With numerous agriculturists, sheep and wool had become a primary object. These interests demanded legislation to offset England's effort to encourage the manufacture of coarse woolens. In furtherance of this end there met at Harrisburg on July 30, 1827, a convention, the primary object of which was to consider the present state of the growers and manufacturers of wool. The items recommended by this conference received consideration in the state legislature, which passed a resolution to instruct their senators and request their representatives in Congress to favor the passage of an act for the encouragement of domestic industry. Great was the indignation of the National Republicans when they learned that far from complying with the recommendation of their state legislature, members of Congress from

The State legislature supports the policy of Protection

---

have some protection to enable it to contend with an old establishment" (page 61, number 206). In 1812, the iron manufacturers of Pennsylvania petitioned Congress to lay "such countervailing duties on imported wrought iron, as will secure a just and reasonable reward to your petitioners." (page 553, number 371).

[5] Iron manufacturers had profited by the impetus given to their industries by earlier tariffs. In three years, thirty-one iron foundaries had appeared in western Pennsylvania, as the result of protective legislation.

Pennsylvania "abandoned the cause and interests of the Farmer, the Wool Grower and the Manufacturer, and voted by compromise from electioneering purposes, in furtherance of Southern policy and British interests, by preventing the adoption of the American System of protective duties." National Republican county meetings decided that the seven Members of Congress from Pennsylvania, who had voted against Protection, "deserved the indignant censure of every Republican in the state." Their names were published under the caption: The "seven traitors of Pennsylvania,—who sold the interests of their state—Let them remove to their friends of the South. Pennsylvania elected them as friends and found them to be traitors." [6]

As is often the case when economic problems become partisan issues, dramatic utterances superceded logical considerations. National Republicans convinced themselves that only under the shelter of their protecting legislation could the gentle art of wool growing be fostered. Having shown the special adaptability of Pennsylvanian hills to this occupation, they argued that it should be encouraged because of its democratic nature. "There is," these politicians proclaimed, "no other branch of industry in which the profits are more equally divided. This raw material is not cultivated on large plantations, which none but the rich can own and carry on. It may be brought to market by the middling farmer, by the poor man." [7]

[6] The Norristown Herald, October 22, 1828; Harrisburg Argus, October 4, July 12, 1828; Bucks County Intelligencer, February 13, 1832; Political Pamphlets, 1832; Niles, October 13, 1827, January 12, 1828.

[7] In some of the more remote parts of the state, manufacturers were springing up which, in those days might call themselves "infant industries." "In Centre County, Pennsylvania, a new county amongst the mountains, there are seventeen establishments employing about one thousand men. Huntington County next to Centre, has three times the number of forges Centre has." National Republicans predicted that coal would render Pennsylvania a great manufacturing state, and enable her "to stand on a par with England in point of enterprise and manufacturing industry." National Republican editors make it a cause of great regret that "while Penn-

Advocaey of the tariff continued as a eardinal point in Whig policy. In 1832, John Sergeant urged the proteetion of our Infant manufactures, and advised that additional encouragement be given to the iron fabrics of Pennsylvania.

Silent on the subject of the American System generally, the Democrats remained silent also on the question of the tariff in particular. Outspoken opposition to Proteetion in the fall of 1828, they feared, "might injure the interests of Jackson in Pennsylvania." Embarrassed, the Democrats of the state looked to Buchanan for moral support; but Buchanan's attitude on the question was uncertain. Probably speaking for himself alone he said, "the public mind everywhere throughout the state seems to be in an unsettled condition." Unwilling to assert himself too boldly one way or the other, he resorted to idealistic generalising. To Wolf, he wrote: "The object of every friend of his country ought now to be to fix the wavering politics of his state upon principle." Buchanan's attitude on the eternal question of Protection being none too well defined, his position was assailed, as was the case of Wolf in regard to the National Bank by both the friends and the enemies of the policy. Some Whig papers found much cause for complaint in his uncertain attitude, and others opposed him with bitterness because he "connected himself with the Jacksonian interests in opposition to the tariff—representing a people whose interests are intimately connected with the manufacturing system." Later in 1830, when people were discussing South Carolinia's Nullification, Buchanan expressed the lofty sentiment that "there are some subjects of a

Democrats non-committal on Protection

---

sylvania is expending millions in the construction of canals and railroads in order that our iron may be brought to market cheap, Congress is about passing a law allowing incorporated companies to import from England *free of duty* all the iron they may want for the construction of many hundreds of miles of railroad and all their machinery, such as steam engines, cast iron waggon wheels, ploughs, pick shovels, blasting tools."

character so sacred that the people of Pennsylvania will never suffer them to be affected by the party politics of the day—among them are the integrity of our Federal Union and the protection of our Domestic Manufactures."[8]

The effect of Nullification on Jackson's popularity

Jackson's successful treatment of the South Carolina tariff episode gained him many friends in a state whose interests were more closely associated with Whig doctrine.s His decided stand against nullification served to offset the unfavorable impression produced by his reputed Southern leaning and Anti-Protectionist tendency. After the famous Proclamation, "Heroites" became more worshipful, and the "malcontents" paused to admire a leader of stern stuff, "a President who does not stop at words." The executive proclamation caused a revulsion of feeling in Jackson's favor, reacting against the earlier National Republican contention that "Jackson would be the tool of the South, to oppose the tariff." Anti-Jacksonites had dreaded Jackson's subserviency to the South, and consequent hostility to Protection. With Southern influence, National Republicans associated British interests. The Pennsylvania Intelligencer published in all sincerity, that "British agents have been distributing money to be expended in electioneering for Jackson to defeat our tariff. Let us rescue our country from the influence of British gold." "The entire Anti-tariff force in the Southern states is in battle array *for* Jackson;" "the mad policy of our Southern Anti-Tariffites is precisely the same as the British policy." Such Anti-English feeling was more noticeable in the counties of Berks and Dauphin; The Harrisburg Argus, with its usual sarcasm printed in the spring of 1828: "A set of new readers of the constitution have sprung up in the South and have raised the Jackson standard; they have deceived a large body of citizens in Penn-

[8] Political Pamphlets, 1832; Pennsylvania Intelligencer, October 14, 1828; Mss., Buchanan, to Wolf, Lancaster, October 15, 1829; Harrisburg Argus, June 14, 1828; Allegheny Democrat, August 10, 1830.

sylvania, but not the great body of them. We want improvements; we wish to stop paying tribute to England for her manufactures. We wish to depend on our own industry and the natural resources of the country for them; we want a home market for our produce.'' [9]

Harrisburg sheets in the fall of 1828 spoke much of ''the crisis,'' and of Southern threats to sever the Union, and of Jackson's sympathy with South Carolina's aims. The Pennsylvania Intelligencer insisted that the election of Jackson would lead to separation of the union and civil war. To this Anti-English-Anti-Southern feeling, attributed to Jackson, the Democrats in becoming dignity attempted no rejoinder. Their party had shown some slight signs of sympathy for the theories of nullification and states rights' doctrines, [10] but the party as a whole throughout the state were more inclined to regard opposition to the tariff as ''chiefly confined to the little strutting and fretful state of South Carolina.'' They declared that the leaders of

Pennsylvania and States' Rights Doctrines

[9] Mss., Buchanan, from J. Randolph Clay, Brussels, January 5, 1832; Pennsylvania Intelligencer, October 7, 14, 1828; Harrisburg Argus, May 19, 1828.

[10] There was a tendency among a few Democrats in the state to sympathize with South Carolina. One enthusiastic Democrat wrote an article, showing that nullification as presented by Mr. Calhoun is in the law of Pennsylvania. Ingham and others were reputed to have come out in favor of nullification saying that ''it is and has been the doctrine professed and practised by the Democratic party of this state and of the Union for the last forty years.'' In Bucks County, states rights doctrines were enunciated, and sentiments against the tariff expressed. The Bucks County Intelligencer declared that ''the tariff must be destroyed, or the Republic is to be at an end.'' A state right convention was advertised to meet at Philadelphia. A ''States Rights Association'' of the County of Bucks held meetings at Doylestown to discuss the nature, origin and character of American federative systems. While sympathizing with the South Carolinians, The Bucks County Intelligencer regretted their rashness. With precision they foresaw that ''at Castle Pickney, which commands Charleston, if matters come to the worst, the first blow will be struck, and dreadful will be the destruction to the brave and generous Carolinians if their infatuation shall urge them to the rash step.''

nullification in South Carolina "have much to answer for and be assured they will be held accountable." [11]

The effect which Nullification produced in Europe, and the President's decisive action, aroused the patriotic fervor of Pennsylvanians. [12] Buchanan writes to Jackson from St. Petersburg: "Independent of their fatal influence at home, they (domestic differences due to nullification) had greatly injured the character of the country abroad. The advocates of despotism throughout Europe beheld our dissensions with delight.....God grant that the restless spirits which have kindled the flame in South Carolina may neither be willing nor able to promote disunion by rendering the Southern states generally disaffected towards the best of Governments.....Whilst the dissensions are ever to be deplored in themselves, they have been most propitious for your fame.....We find generally but few extracts from American papers in the European Journals; but whilst the South Carolina question was pending, your proclamation as well as every fact to elucidate its history was published on this side of the Atlantic." From London, Buchanan hears: "The monarchists everywhere predict the dissolution of our union." Patriotic motives, if not partisan interest, inspired sympathy with Jackson's course. Randolph Clay writes to Buchanan from Havre: "It would be curious if two months should find me on my road to Charleston with a musket on my shoulder to help the General government to put the gallant Southerners to order." From Philadelphia, another Democrat patriotically inspired, wrote: "I would wage a Civil War of ten and a foreign war of fifty years

[11] Pennsylvania Intelligencer, September 30, October 7, 1828; Bucks County Intelligencer, October 17, 24, 1831; Mss., Buchanan, from George Plitt, Washington, August 1, 1832.

[12] From Brussels, Buchanan learns, "All the papers at Brussels are chuckling at the prospect of our Republic's ruin. From Havre, he hears "The Nullifiers are bent upon destroying the tariff or seceding from the union. All Europe is glad."

to preserve the Union.'' Politicians throughout the state agreed that Jackson had handled the crisis boldly and successfully. Even Democrats, who did not support Protection, realized that the trouble in South Carolina arose ''from unhallowed and ungratified ambition, the tariff being but the pretext.'' Democrats could boast that the Proclamation concerning Nullification was ''pretty generally approved in Pennsylvania.'' Proud and exultant, Jackson wrote to Buchanan, ''I met Nullification at its threshold, my proclamation was well timed.'' [13]

The defeat of Nullification was a victory for both parties; it aroused great admiration for Jackson, and at the same time, vindicated the principle of Protection—a phase of the Whig policy comprehended in the term, ''American System.''

Another and more important aspect of this System was the policy of Internal Improvements. Those who favored Protection would consequently support the policy which advocated a better means whereby goods should be brought to the market. The building of canals and railroads would increase safety and speed, and decrease expense. Such were the arguments put forth in the National Republican literature of the day; their newspapers in 1828 spoke of the need of ''good roads to take coal and provisions to market.'' [14] Just as was the case in England, the first need for railroads was experienced in coal producing regions. [15]

The Internal Improvement policy in local politics

[13] Mss., Buchanan, to Jackson, St. Petersburg, May 22, 1833, from Vail, London, April 2, 1833; from Randolph Clay, Havre, January 10, 1833; from Judge Rogers, Philadelphia, January 2, 1833; from Pleasanton, Washington, January 30, 1833, April 2, 1833; from Jackson, Washington, March 21, 1833.

[14] Harrisburg Argus, February 23, 1828.

[15] The use of anthracite coal had greatly increased after 1820 when only three hundred tons were consumed. The quantity of coal brought down the Schuylkill River in 1826, was 16,767 tons; the corresponding figures two years later are 47,284 tons. In Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania, in 1826, there were eight furnaces that were making upwards of six thousand tons of pig metal and castings annually, and ten forges, which made about 2,350 tons of bar-iron, nails, etc. In 1828, the manufacture of steel had been commenced with great success in Pittsburg.

But those localities which were loudest in acclaiming the need of Internal Improvements and which consequently advertised the promises of National Republicanism were those which would enjoy the advantages of trade. The connection of the East with the "Western Emporium" would be the making of the towns along the main line West. In Pittsburg, Harrisburg and Columbia, the all important question was that of Internal Improvements. Commercial interests would greatly benefit by the canal. The towns along the Susquehanna between Columbia and Harrisburg praised those leaders whose policy meant the completion of better communications between east and west. The Harrisburg Argus, The Harrisburg Intelligencer, and The Columbia Spy in the interest of Internal Improvements eulogized Clay and his party to the exclusion of all other matters of political import. In 1827, the Harrisburg Argus spoke of John Quincy Adams as "the deviser of a system of Internal Improvements."[16]

Towns along the Susquehanna support Clay

National Republican campaign literature stressed a candidate's fitness according as to whether or not he would support the popular policy.

While the National Republicans remained positive in their assertion of the policy, the Democrats were not opposed. The crying need for better communication was too obvious to be discountenanced by the other and larger party. The need for safer methods of travel was imperative;[17] petitions by the score were sent to Harrisburg begging the legislature to construct dams, turnpikes, bridges, canals, state roads, railroads, toll bridges. Such petitions were referred to their appropriate committees, where often they reposed in peace.[18] Speedier methods of tran-

[16] The Harrisburg Argus, December 22, 1827.

[17] In 1829, the road from Chester to Philadelphia was "so poor that wagons were 'stalled' on their way in by being sunk in the mud."

[18] Harrisburg Argus, December 22, 1827; Journal of the House of Representatives, Pennsylvania, January, 1829; United States Gazette, November 11, 1828.

sit were desired for the traveling public as well as for the transportation of commercial commodities.[19] It was generally recognized that the canal would eliminate time and space. In 1835, Pennsylvania could boast of 24 miles in two hours and thirty-four minutes as "unparalleled speed upon the canal—though the horses were unaccustomed to the business."[20]

The National Republicans then were the open and avowed advocates of a policy, the advantages of which were obvious. There was no doubt as to the need for better facilities of transportation. The problem was then as to the manner of construction. Would the state itself undertake the task? The animosity to any sort of monopoly as seen in the opposition to the United States Bank was reflected also in relation to projects concerned with construction of Internal Improvements. The Democratic papers which denounced the "mammoth Monopoly" denounced all other types of corporations. Since there was "general opposition to incorporating of any kind," it was incumbent upon the state to assume responsibility and itself commence the "gigantic undertaking." On February 24, 1826, the Pennsylvaina legislature passed its first law authorizing the construction of canals and railroads "exclusively at the expense of and for the benefit of the Commonwealth." In this year there was placed under contract forty-nine and a half miles. In 1828, the Columbia Railroad—eighty miles long—was commenced.[21]

The State itself builds the Columbia Railroad

In his December message of 1828, Governor Schulze de-

[19] When Jackson traveled through Pennsylvania in the winter of 1829, he could cover only twenty-five miles a day; even in summer it required three and a half days to reach Pittsburg from Philadelphia. In the summer of 1829, "when a distance of 228 miles was performed in 24 hours," the event was chronicled as worthy of note.

[20] Bucks County Intelligencer, June 24, 1835.

[21] American Daily Advertiser, February 4, 1829; Mss., Coryell, from Marks, Washington, February 28, 1829.

seribed the nine divisions embraeed in the line of eanals, which would eover 409 miles, 111 of which were then finished. [22]

Before the end of the year 1833, Pennsylvania led all the other states in the union in the eonstruetion of railroads. She had completed 15, and projeeted 67; New York, Massaehusetts and North Carolina eombined had eompleted only 14 and pro jeeted only 32. All other states had eompleted less than three. At the end of the year 1833 there were 711½ miles of eanal and railroad under eontract. In the spring of 1834 there were in Pennsylvania 632 miles ready for use. In the fall of 1834 Wolf and the heads of departments at Harrisburg eame down to Philadelphia to examine the railway from Columbia on the Susquehanna to Philadelphia. "This is a proud day for the Governor and his friends," relates Vaux to Van Buren. The towns along the Susquehanna saw in the completion of the canal projeet a realization of their dreams. [23]

Pennsylvania leads in the construction of railroads

The exultation of the little town of Columbia is pathetie in the light of her present staus as a eommereial port. She had pictured to herself a bright future. All her hopes were eentered in the eanal and railroad. In 1831, the "Columbia Spy" predicted that the little town was "destined to beeome the most im-

[22] In the summer of 1833, Benjamin F. West thus reports progress: "From Philadelphia westward 22 miles of the road are completed and in constant use. At about this distance the Pennsylvania Railroad, as this is frequently called, receives two miles west of Paoli, the West Chester Railroad. From Columbia, the Pennsylvania Canal up the Susquehanna to its junction with the Juniata—a distance of forty-two miles is completed. From the junction of the Susquehanna and Juniata to Hollidaysburg is 128 miles; here the Pennsylvania Canal joins the Allegheny Portage Railroad. This road is nearly completed. It extends from Hollidaysburg across the Allegheny mountains to Johnstown—its length is thirty-six miles. From Johnstown by canal to Pittsburg is 107 miles. Thus the distance from Philadelphia to Pittsburg by canal and rail is 394 miles.

[23] Edinburgh Review, October, 1834; Chronicle of the Times, December 31, 1833; Mss., Van Buren, from Vaux, Philadelphia, October 9, 1834; The Columbia Spy, April 7, 1831.

portant place on the Susquehanna.....We look forward to the completion of the canal and railroad. Columbia will be the place of deposit for all that shall come down either on the river or canal intended for the Baltimore and Philadelphia markets.'' [24]

The towns of Midletown and Marietta were equally exultant. As early as 1828, the water was let into the Pennsylvania canal and one or two boats arrived in Harrisburg from Middletown. [25] These towns gave their political support to the party which represented the policy which promised completion of the great undertaking. The Whigs claimed the policy of Internal Improvements as their party measure but the Democrats when in office gave their enemies small cause for complaint. [26]

Off the main line, the work of Internal Improvements had not been neglected. By the year 1835, northern towns were holding Internal Improvement meetings in which they approved of Wolf's course. Canal celebrations were frequent. The breaking of ground on the various divisions was accompanied by appropriate political ceremonies. Elsewhere in the state, Wolf was supported as one who favored Internal Improvements. Support of the system was essential to the success of the candidates of any party. Even the Anti-Masons boasted that Ritner would further the great work. During the gubernatorial campaign of 1829, Democrats in Pittsburg hailed Wolf as one who ''supported the Pennsylvania canal and thus sustained the vital interests of the Western Emporium.'' [27] The policy in itself then was univers-

[24] Proud citizens of Columbia boasted: ''Four stages pass through here daily, two from Philadelphia and two from Baltimore.''

[25] The Harrisburg Argus, May 19, 1828.

[26] The location of the terminus of the Columbia Railroad in Philadelphia was a matter of great moment for the city officials. Many business men wanted the railroad to terminate in the ''centre of the city''—Market Street between eighth and Broad Streets—rather than at the river fronts. Finally the councils of the city passed a resolution ''approving of the termination of the railroad at the intersection of Broad and Vine Streets.''

[27] Mss., Wolf, from Ward, Montrose, January 9, 1835; Bucks County Intelligencer, October 20, 22, 1827; Allegheny Democrat, October 6, 1829.

ally supported. It remained for the party out of office to criticise the administrative manner of execution.

The state controlled the building of the canal and railroads and therefore appointed the canal commissioners. They received as a salary three and later four dollars a day. They were accused by Jacksonites in March, 1829, of using their position to promote National Republican sentiment. The Harrisburg Chronicle says: "The canal commissioners—we presume will be ex-officio travelling electioneers—at three dollars a day. They may be continued in office; but per adventure the electioneering portion of them may not be allowed the funds necessary to carry on the summer campaign." The canal commissioners appointed by Governor Schulze were accused of having "made a fearful onset against the Military Chieftain." A Harrisburg Democratic paper comments that the people of Pennsylvania should judge whether a commissioner's time "ought to be spent in the concoction of political letters, and in lending the authority of his name to Clay's sentiments." Although the recognition of the canal and railroad policy as National-Republican was especially marked in the western part of the state, one or two National Republican papers in this section made an earnest effort to disassociate politics and the great uncompleted task. The Pennsylvania Intelligencer begged the people to "consider that the completion of our great system of Internal Improvements is not a matter of politics. The cry of Jackson and Wolf may do very well at the election ground; but it will neither restore our credit, bring money into the treasury, nor save the carrying trade from the states of New York, Maryland and Ohio." Democrats, too, tried to satisfy themselves that the question was not a political one. From Middletown, Pennsylvania, Simon Cameron writes: (In July, 1833) "The canal question had not much effect upon the election, and the defeat of Wolf would have had no effect upon the improvement of the state. In the southern counties

The Canal Commissioners and politics

where they are not benefited by the canal, he lost votes, and in the western and northwestern he gained about as many; and if Ritner had been elected, he would have been compelled to finish the work commenced, which is all that will be done by Wolf."

Pleas for the completion of the Philadelphia and Columbia Railroad were reported in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. A National Republican meeting in Philadelphia in 1833 transmitted to the Governor resolutions to the effect that "the legislature of Pennsylvania try to prevent the delay or abandonment of the works now in progress for the promotion of the great interests of this commonwealth." Wolf's message of this year strongly urged the completion of canals and railroads. Thus the Whigs were given little cause for complaint. They could only lament the loans and taxes which completion would necessitate. [28]

State financing and Anti-Administration criticism

The financing of the system was an enormous task, and taxed the state beyond its capacity and credit, thus arousing criticism from the National Republicans when that party was out of office. The work did not in any instance pay for itself. The income from tolls was hopelessly small. [29] The attempt to raise money by additional tolls and discriminating charges "produced considerable sensation," for "the canal is considered a public highway upon which all our citizens have equal rights; to discriminate, therefore, is deemed an exercise of unlawful power." An effort to force boats upon the canal caused an unfavorable re-

[28] Harrisburg Chronicle, September 22, 1828, March 30, 1829, Feb., 1829; Mss., Coryell, from Clarke, Beaver, October, 1831; Pennsylvania Intelligencer, August 28, 1829; Mss., Van Buren, Simon Cameron to Dix of New York, from Middletown, Pennsylvania, July 17, 1833; Mss., letter to Wolf, January 4, 1834.

[29] For the year 1827 tolls throughout the state on canals and railroads yielded only $60,000. In the case of turnpikes, the tolls were far from adequate. In the year 1833, when 632 miles of canal and railroad were almost completed, the tolls paid into the treasury reached the sum merely of $151,000, whereas expenditures for repairs in the same year amounted to over $275,000.

Tolls and discriminating charges

aetion against Wolf, whose friends advised him to give up the projeet as not worth the loss of political support. But Wolf felt that it was not fair to treat equally those who use the eanal and those who use the river when they applied to enter the canal at a given plaee.[30] The poliey of imposing tolls was injudicious from a politieal point of view. Moreover, the sum yielded was inadequate; the whole Internal Improvement projeet was far from being self supporting. Therefore, the state was obliged to resort to borrowing. Sinee 1826, the legislature had been appropriating immense sums. The administration tried to reeoncile the neeessity of completing the system with the neeessity for curbing expenditures. In either ease, ground was furnished for adverse criticism, for if National-Republieans could not complain that the system was not being completed, they eould claim that the state was running into debt head over heels. While many National-Republiean papers eritieised the policy of borrowing, other papers of the same party persuasion urged further appropriations. The United States Gazette hopes "that our state legislature will not be deterred from eontinuing its generous appropriations for the eanal." Through the year 1828, the eanal eommissioners every three or four weeks requested the Governor to authorize them to borrow sums of varying amounts ranging from $5000 to $220,000. At the end of the year they recommended a permanent loan of $800,000. The legislature passed a bill to this effeet by a majority of three-fourths and on December 19, Governor Sehulze signed the bill. The sum expended during the ensuing year was over and above the amount granted, so that at the end of the year 1829 the legislature was considering a bill authorizing a temporary loan of $1,000,000. Throughout the years 1829 and 1830 the legislature appropriated sums to be paid to the commissioners of the Internal Improvement fund of

Loans to the state

[30] Mss., Wolf, from J. Wagener, Easton, May 13, 1834, to D. Wagener, Harrisburg, May 22, 1834.

the state.[31] Thus, the financial indebtedness of the state was constantly increasing. And yet, petitions reached Harrisburg urging that the canals be completed. Schulze authorized frequent loans. These were secured from banks throughout the state, north, south, east and west, from Westmoreland and Pittsburg to Chester and Philadelphia, and from Chambersburg and York to Northampton and Easton. On March 24, 1828, $2,000,000 were loaned to the Commonwealth for which the Bank of Pennsylvania took certificates of stock at five per cent. Two months later the bank found that it was unable to loan the state the amount agreed upon owing to the "present demand for money in this city and the inability of this institution to satisfy the demands of all its customers." The bank could, however, loan a small sum at six per cent. In the summer of 1828, the bank opened a negotiation in Europe from whence they raised the necessary supplies. An Anti-Administration paper comments: "If the credit of the state is at so low an ebb that we must go a *begging to Europe* for the necessary supplies when money is a plenty between individuals at five per cent, we will at once put the saddle upon the right horse by ascribing it to the canal commissioners." The following year the Secretary of the Commonwealth spent several days in Philadelphia "endeavoring to negotiate the state loan, or such part of it as will enable the canal commissioners to go on with their work." The necessity of completing the system of canals and the endeavor to secure further loans reacted unfavorably upon the Governor. A Wolf paper in Harrisburg explains: "When Schulze was in office and millions were appropriated for making canals and railroads, we heard not one word about a public debt from the special friends of that officer; but when Wolf is elected governor and further appropriations are found necessary, the friends of Schulze calculate the amount of the state debt." By the beginning of the year 1830, Anti-Administrationists were singing:—"Pennsyl-

Loans from banks in Pennsylvania and in Europe

vania groans under the millions of her loans.'' [32] And yet when Ritner came into office, he continued the policy of Wolf. The appropriations which he authorized for canal expenses were according to Democratic estimates enormous. In 1838, Democrats opposed Ritner because ''the public debt has so increased under his administration.....When he came into office it was $24,000,000 for 800 miles of canals and railroads, and now the debt has grown to $32,000,000.'' [33]

Before the end of the session, it was proposed to appropriate $3,200,000 for the current year for Internal Improvements. This with the $800,000 authorized to be borrowed at the commencement of the session would make the permanent loan for 1829 $4,000,000. The permanent loan that was finally determined upon reached only little more than one-half this amount.

The Philadelphia Saving Fund loaned the state for Railroads and Canals more than $23,000 in 1836, and in 1841, $71,000 and more.

Money for the completion of the canals was secured not only from the banks of the state but from state controlled lotteries. For the Union Canal Lattery, commissioners were appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania to superintend the drawings. The prizes ranged from $10,000 to $5. [34] The use of the

[31] Norristown Herald, July 2, 1828; United States Gazette, December 23, 1828; Mss., Schulze, 1828, in passim, Pennsylvania, House of Representatives, December 10, 1828.

[32] Mss., Executive minutes, Harrisburg, May 28, 1830; Mss., Schulze, 1828.

[33] Mss., Schulze, 1828, passim; Harrisburg Chronicle, July 7, 1828, July 13, 1829, November 19, 1829; Mss., Wolf, November 8, 1829; The Republic and Anti-Masonic Inquirer, January 2, 1830; Mss., Ritner, at the State Library, for the years 1835-1838; American Volunteer, April 19, 1838.

[34] American Daily Advertiser, July 1, 1829. In Philadelphia, lottery tickets for class thirteen were for sale at ten dollars. In November, 1828, this class was drawn; one prize was for $20,000, and over four thousand prizes for $10. In the following year, class fourteen was drawn for which the first prize was $30,000. (Philadelphia Daily Chronicle, November 1, 1828; Harrisburg Chronicle, November 19, 1829).

lottery was opposed by the Whigs who denounced it as a Democratic institution. Other avenues by which to secure loans were sought. The state advertised for individual subscribers.[35] One notable contributor was Girard who by his will bequeathed to the Commonwealth $300,000 " 'for the purpose of Internal Improvement by canal navigation' provided that within one year laws were enacted to enable the city of Philadelphia to carry out the improvement of Delaware Avenue, Water Street and the removal of wooden buildings."[36] On the whole but few individuals subscribed, and the state faced the embarrassing possibility of being obliged to relinquish her great undertaking. In July, 1829, the Governor tells the president of the board of canal commissioners that "it has not been possible to obtain the permanent loan." The president of the board of canal commissioners asks Blythe, the secretary of the board, whether there is "any reasonable prospect of procuring the necessary funds to meet the present engagements of the state for public works authorized by law, and now in progress of execution?"[37]

Loans from individuals in the state and in England

In its effort to secure loans, the state was obliged to borrow in England. Baring Brothers of London took out Pennsylvania certificates which were transferable between individuals. Thus many persons in England held Pennsylvania certificates.[38]

The practice of borrowing from England furnished the Anti-Administrationists with campaign ammunition in the summer of 1829. The Anti-Masonic Herald advised "every farmer who does not want his farm mortgaged to England for every cent it

[35] Isaac Wayne of Chester County, lent on account of the Pennsylvania Canal and Railroad Loan, $3000 at two per cent.

[36] McMaster—Life and Times of Stephen Girard—Vol. II, page 453; Mss., Schulze, June, 1828. A banker of Leeds, England, in October, 1828, loaned the sum of $18,500 at five per cent.

[37] Mss., Schulze, July 2, 1829, to Scott; July 1, 1829, Scott to Blythe.

[38] Mss., Schulze, 1827-8-9. In the spring of 1828, Baring Brothers loaned Pennsylvania $31,700, all of which they transferred to various individuals in England during the following September.

is worth, to vote for Joseph Ritner, who alone at this crisis, can save the state from bankruptcy.'' The need of constant borrowating at home and abroad, and the slowness of the work furnished campaign material by which the governor might be praised or blamed. But Pennsylvania Governors at this particular period, if without honor at home in their own state, were subjects of eulogy abroad. The Pennsylvania system of canal and railroad building was praised in England, in dailies, weeklies and even in Parliament itself. [39]

Englishmen found much to admire in the fact that the work was managed by the state itself rather than by certain groups of individuals. Pennsylvania was furnishing Englishmen with an example by which they could plead for the government ownership of Railroads. [40]

A contemporary non-political appreciation of Pennsylvania's task

The Edinburg Review for 1829 contains a long article in explanation of the Pennsylvania system of railroads and canals and concludes by comparing the method of individual construction obtaining in England with the method of state control exercised in Pennsylvania. In Parliament, this generous criticism was made: ''The Americans have set us a good example in the management of their public works, and in the proceedings in their legislatures. Whether their practice in this respect be owing to the peculiarities of their social condition or the nature of their political institutions, or to what other cause, I will not venture to conjecture.'' [41]

[39] Anti-Masonic Herald, November 27, 1829, August 21, 1832.

[40] A British editor comments: ''The rail-roads in England should not have been thrown so absolutely into the hands of individual enterprise, the state should have either undertaken their construction or imposed some control upon their management.''

[41] Parliamentary Debates, 1836, page 987; Edinburgh Review, 1834. In reply, an English railroad company declared that it did not see any more reason for publishing the contracts between railroad company and landowners than ''for any other common society transaction being made public.''

The state of Pennsylvania published its records to the most minute detail. Every item of expense was tabulated, from the salary of the canal commissioners to the wages of the meanst laborer, and from the cost of the imported tool to the priee of the smallest nail.[42] And administration papers were free to praise the economy practiced, and Anti-Administration papers to critieise the extravaganee indulged in. With sueh freedom from censorship, British commentators were greatly impressed. They wrote: "We have been struck by the public spirit and candour whieh eharacterize the proceedings of our transatlantic eountrymen.....The details of constructing railroads are laid before the public in America. This publicity operates as a eheek upon the spirit of *jobbing*.....But English people are kept in the dark." In Parliament it was recognized also that "In America the projectors of eanals or railways were not required to give large bonuses to landed proprietors." In England, railroad proprietors had to comply with exorbitant claims, in one instance the railroad had a law suit over every six miles. The question of compensation in England had entailed bribery, and fraudulent legal deeisions. The railroad paid larger sums to proprietors "who were considered to have influence in Parliament than to others, in order to get rid of opposition." Such "stock jobbing," it was repeated, was unknown in America. The result was that in Pennsylvania, although the principal materials for eonstruction were imported from England and although the physical nature of the eountry rendered the work of construetion far more difficult,[43] yet the cost of one of the earliest railroads in this

Pennsylvania's records published in detail

[42] Stone masons received per day $1.50; bricklayers the same amount, and laborers $1.12½.

[43] Parliamentary Papers, 1845. Among the difficulties which delayed the construction of the Columbia Railroad and raised the cost of construction was the almost total failure to procure stone blocks in the lime stone valleys through which the road passed. "2300 tons of stone blocks had to be hauled a distance of twelve and sometimes even twenty miles.....This difficulty caused two-thirds of the contractors to abandon their jobs."

state was only $3,060 a mile as against $100,00—the cost of every mile of the Liverpool and Manchester Railroad. Thus the system of construction which met with the great disapproval of the party out of office and brought upon the heads of Pennsylvania Governors the charge of extravagance and corruption was worthy to receive the praise of Englishmen, which was praise indeed.[44]

Adverse criticism largely due to political jealousy

In England, corruption in connection with early railway construction was too obvious to be denied; in Pennsylvania, traces of corruption are comparatively insignificant; here the criticisms leveled against the state by the party out of power were largely the result of political pique. The disheartening difficulties of the task and the almost fruitless endeavors to obtain capital might have convinced administration leaders of the advisability of abandoning the task; but such was the political pressure brought to bear by anti-administrationists that state officials, to maintain their position of political leadership, were impelled to continue the work, and to sink the state further and further into debt. Thus administrationists were destined to gain nothing by carrying out a political measure which they dared not disregard, for if not open to the charge of failure to comply with the popular policy, they were fated to suffer under the charge of incompetency and extravagance. Thus, again, as in the case of the National Bank, the Whigs, tenaciously upholding a policy and criticising Democratic methods, won to their banner many adherents, and so helped to diminish the Democratic forces in the state.

[44] Hazard—1—91; Quarterly Review, 1830; Parliamentary Papers, 1845; Debates—Commons XXXIII—1836, 589; Parliamentary Debates, April 26, 1836, Commons; Edinburgh Review, 1834; Niles, October 20, 1827; Annual Register, 1830, 1831, p. 169, September 1; Quarterly Review, 1824.

CHAPTER V

The Third Constitutional Convention and Historic Problems

In 1825, an agitation was set on foot to supplant the old constitution of 1790 by an altogether new instrument. Many of the problems which aroused long and heated discussions in the convention of 1838 never received a place in the constitution of that year. Many of them are with us even to-day. The politicians of the late thirties pondered long and earnestly as to the advisability of the extension of the franchise. Beyond the political freedom of the Negro, they foresaw the larger problem of his social position. The school question, as other matters which figured in the political life of the time, was considered at length in the convention. This body viewed with sincere consideration numbers of petitions which prayed that free instruction be afforded in the German language. The question of the exemption from military training to be accorded to conscientious objectors was debated for several days during the summer of 1837. Deliberations to curtail the powers of the governor, and to limit his tenure resulted in the insertion of amendments. The question of the Observance of the Sabbath was respectfully argued, and finally into the new constitution was incorporated the principle of further amendment. Besides these problems, the convention considered others which have not survived the times. Much was said about abolishing lotteries, about the extravagance incident to the canal and railroad policy, about Antimasonry and other questions purely contemporary.

Long [1] and heated as were the debates, they were practically without result. The changes incorporated into the new consti-

[1] The convention lasted from May, 1837, until February, 1838; the proceedings occupy fourteen volumes of closely printed material.

Division of opinion along party lines

tution were few and insignificant. The sincerity of the delegates in striving to effect reforms is debatable. According to Stevens, fire-eating protagonist of the Negro and of Antimasonry, the delegates instead of voting on the reform principle, voted on the Van Buren principle. Many of the "reformers," may we add, though sad to relate, voted on the Stevens principle. More than one delegate recognized "the talents of Stevens for drilling," and insisted that efforts were made to drive men from their principles by appeals to party and allusions to party distinctions, and to secure from them a vote against their honest convictions. Other delegates claimed, on the contrary, that "there was no combination except that which principle always produced among honest and honorable men." Of the Philadelphia delegation in particular, it was said: no matter how the members of the city and county of Philadelphia stood as to democracy, no matter how hostile they might be on any question of party politics, they united on any subject in which the interests of the city were concerned. No considerations of party could separate them from their common interests. In the legislature, they had voted against every proposition to remove obstructions from the Susquehanna, for fear that some persons would prefer carrying their produce down it to Baltimore, in preference to carrying it across the mountains on horseback to Philadelphia.[2]

The convention met in the spring of 1837; but anticipatory measures had long been in operation. In 1825 a law was passed to ascertain the sense of the people of Pennsylvania on the subject of a call of a convention. The people, however, refused to have a convention, because there was no limit to the power of that convention.[3] But two years later, the people of the state voted for a convention with limited powers. In 1833, Democratic meetings advocated changes in the old constitution, because "it did

[2] Debates—Pennsylvania Convention—1837-1838, 11—387-8, 64.

not fit present conditions, and because of the great and arbitrary power given by it to the governor.'' In the spring of 1835, an act was signed by Governor Wolf providing for the submission of the matter to the people, at the next election. Before the end of the year, the returns of the several counties were published. Of the fifty-two counties, twenty-one opposed the convention; they were located for the most part in the southeastern part of the state. The vote of Philadelphia County was 10,442 as against 7,883 in favor of the convention. The majority from the supporting counties was 13,404. The legislature, therefore, passed the act (March 29., 1836), which was approved by Governor Ritner, calling for a convention to meet on May 2., 1837. The delegates were to be elected in November, 1836; their number was to equal the number of members of both houses, and to be apportioned in the same manner. [4]

Prominent delegates from Philadelphia were John Sergeant, Charles J. Ingersoll, Martin, Earl, and Hopkinson. Other important delegates were Stevens of Adams County, Brown of Northampton and Darlington of Chester County, whose ideas on the Negro question were to conflict, Konigmaeker of Lancaster, Sterigere, Dunlap, and Magee of Perry County. The first named was elected president of the convention.

Prominent delegates

One of the vexed questions to be settled was that of the extension of suffrage. The debates on this point resulted in the insertion of the word White in the amended constitution. The growth of Democratic ideas involving the extension of the fran-

Problems debated

[3] Others opposed the convention on less substantial grounds, feeling that it was ''much better for us both as citizens and republicans to remain under the constitution, which we have found to work well for upwards of fifty years.'' A Democratic meeting in Erie County in February, 1834, resolved that ''although defects may be found in the constitution of Pennsylvania, yet the state having existed prosperously under it, we are willing to try it a while longer and more especially as during the present excitement in the country it would be impolitic to attempt alterations.''

[4] The Erie Observer, February 4, 1834.

chise was a tendency of the period. But conservative leaders in Pennsylvania hesitated to hurl full political rights upon the innocent and unsuspecting Negro who formed an unwelcome and unappreciated element in the population of the state.[5] That his presence was not welcome we may suppose from the number of petitions received in the convention urging that negro immigration be prohibited.[6]

The extension of the franchise

Magee introduced a resolution urging that the constitution be amended so as to prohibit the future "emigration into" this state of free persons of colour, and fugitive slaves from other states or territories. On June ninth, Dunlap moved a like proposition. Stevens, as was to be expected, wanted the resolution indefinitely postponed. Darlington, likewise, ironically asked that the immigration proposed to be prohibited should include foreigners. He wished that some inquiry should be made in reference to the number of paupers that are daily cast upon our shores from the various countries of Europe; such a nuisance should be prohibited. Cummins of Juniata did not want foreigners placed among slaves and negroes. He could not understand why Darlington had made such an association of colours and kinds, and why he had cast a reproach on foreigners.[7]

[5] In some quarters, the constitutional convention had been opposed on the ground that it would provoke the question of negro suffrage; a remonstrance signed by Lewis S. Coryell and Charles E. Du Bois was to this effect: "If the old constitution continues, the negroes never can vote; ..... but if the new constitution is adopted no one can say what will be done. Many abolitionists will vote for the new constitution in hopes of getting such a change as will give the negroes the right to vote."

[6] Some localities had interested themselves in "African Colonization." During the year 1832 the Bucks County Intelligencer daily devoted to this topic two or more columns of its scant issues.

[7] In the several constitutional conventions held a decade later in the Northwestern states, these questions of negro immigration and suffrage were similarly discussed, with the difference that in the later conventions the negroes had no such sympathetic protagonists as Stevens and Darlington. Debates of the several Northwestern states Conventions, 1846-1850.

The debates on the political position of the negro interest us to-day as corresponding rather more closely to the re-actionary views which we hold now than to the extreme views supported by Northern radicals prior to and for some time after the Civil War. It may be noticed, too, that the assertions of Pennsylvania leaders in 1837 are strangely similar to those made by Southern statesmen in the fifties. Darlington and Stevens, however, represent the extreme school of the North, which went so far as to advocate the political equality of the races. Darlington urged that Pennsylvania should follow the example of other states in which, as he claimed, free persons of colour were allowed to vote. Petitions by the score came from the outraged populace, some demanding that the Negro should not be given the right of suffrage, and still others stating that such was his constitutional right and privilege. Most interesting of the later sort was one from "sundry free citizens of colour of the town of Pittsburg," remonstrating against the adoption of any provision depriving free citizens of the right of suffrage.[8] Stevens said that the memorial should not be rejected simply because it came from those who are called "people of colour." He asked, "are we to be told that we are not to publish this memorial because it will be offensive to the South.....Let those who stand in fear of the South truckle to their debasing tyranny!" After much

The political status of the Negro

[8] The petition reads: "The undersigned have heard that the constitution may be so amended as to make the right of suffrage depend not on the fact of being a freeman and a tax-payer, but on the complexion, whether dark or fair, which it may have pleased God to confer on the good people of this Commonwealth.....It has long been deemed, both at home and abroad a matter of just sarcasm that whilst the Declaration of Independence boasts of the universal equality of man, in many of the states one-half of the community is the absolute property of the other—subject to the despotic will, nay to the passion, caprice, and cruelty of a master. In Pennsylvania, public sentiment has triumphed over this glaring inconsistency .....In Pennsylvania, the coloured man under her liberal and enlightened policy has been taught to feel that he has an interest in common with the white man in sustaining her free institutions."

debate it was decided to print the memorial.[9] Later, petitions were presented against diminishing political rights on account of a difference of colour.[10] Throughout the entire sessions even as late as the closing days of the convention, petitions against negro suffrage were introduced. The question of receiving the petitions was brought up, but was not settled.[11] One long memorial stated that under the constitution of Pennsylvania, as it now stands, negroes have not the right of suffrage, and ought not to have it. At the same time contradictory petitions were received against making any alteration in the constitution diminishing the right of suffrage. The language used in the suffrage petitions varied. A number of them spoke against the "amalgamation" of the whites and blacks, the intention being to prevent negro suffrage. A large number of the petitions, addressed to the convention, that were opposed to negro suffrage came from the German counties. One from Bucks County containing almost a yard of signatures, most of which were in German script, declared that: "the negro race have always been considered and treated by our laws as inferior in political condition to the white. Since 1780, they have civil rights as distinguished from political rights; they cannot control the government of the Whites, yet the negroes in Bucks County have voted, and frequently the majority of the Whites have been controlled by the

Petitions from the German counties oppose Negro suffrage

[9] Another petition from free coloured citizens of Pittsburg spoke of negroes as "the decided friends of good order," explaining that they had their own churches, and free coloured schools; and that in Alleghenytown, seven of the seventy-five negroes owned real estate.

[10] Several memorials from free negroes of Philadelphia protested against the insertion of the word White in the new constitution.

[11] Ingersoll felt that petitioners should be treated with great respect; but did "not hesitate to affirm the Female petitioners concerning political affairs—a perversion, like all the rest of this abolition infatuaiton, descended upon us from England—present one of those unnatural Anti-social and deplorable errors of the times—the unsexing of the gentler part of the community, which, in time, will prove a greater evil than slavery can ever be described to be."

votes of the Blacks. The memorialists believe that their rights as white citizens and freemen have thus been violated and trampled upon by negroes; we request that a clause be inserted in the constitution providing that no one of the negro race be permitted to vote. Your memorialists would also call attention to the manifest design of a considerable class of abolitionists and amalgamationists, to interfere with and prostrate the compact in the constitution of the United States between the northern states and our brethren of the South. Believing that if the mad design of these men shall succeed, that it will be productive of civil war and widespread desolation, we ask that if any constitutional provision can remedy the evil, it be applied."[12] In another petition from Bucks County, the memorialists deemed it "unwise and impolitic to make any alteration in the existing constitution on the subject of the rights of citizenship and suffrage, believing that such amendments would tend to increase the present excitement which pervades the whole union on the subject of slavery." A petition from Schuylkill County was to the effect that "the effort to endow the Black with rights wholly conflicting with the customs and usages of the country are at variance with the intent and meaning of the constitution, which forms the Compact of this Union." Ingersoll said: "Until social prejudice may be overcome on our part, and social degradation on the part of the blacks, all attempts at political privileges must fail. But the prevailing sentiment of the state judged by

[12] Abolitionism had not as yet become respectable enough to receive the serious consideration of politicians. As yet, the term was semi-opprobrious in connotation. When Ritner was accused in 1838 of being an abolitionist, friendly newspapers hastened to explain away any possible connection that their candidate might have had with the unpopular cause. But Democrats, "being hard run for available objections to Governor Ritner, stuck to their false assertion that he was an abolitionist." Other Democrats, exonerating Ritner of the charge of being a sincere abolitionist, maintained that he "deprecated the oppression of the black race because it is almost as good a political *hobby* as the murder of Morgan."

the petitions sent to the constitutional convention throughout its sessions was in favor of negro suffrage on the perverted plea that "all men are created equal." [13]

Petitions from Philadelphia and Cheter Counties advocated jury trial for slaves, [14] both for those entering the state and for citizens of Pennsylvania who had been "sentenced to imprisonment for life, in the character of slaves upon Southern plantations." The memorialists urged that the new constitution should read: "The trial by jury shall be as heretofore, and in questions affecting life or liberty shall be extended to every human being." In the convention, Biddle frankly urged that "trial by jury should be granted to all persons who may be arrested as fugitives from labor, or who shall claim to be freemen."

Jury trial for slaves

The question of the political staus of the negro was again brought forward when the convention proceeded to consider the qualifications of a voter. Brown of Philadelphia favored giving the rights of an elector to every citizen of the United States, native or naturalized, of the age of twenty-one who shall have resided in the state six months preceding the election. Clarke of Indiana County wanted the right of suffrage as broad as the population, and wanted to see all tax and property qualification taken out of the constitution. Every citizen of the Commonwealth should be entitled to enjoy the franchise. The age of voting should be twenty-eight instead of twenty-one. Age and residence qualifications were discussed at length; but the most dramatic phase of the suffrage discussion was its application to the Negro. Sterigere opposed introducing into the new constitution the words: "free male *white* citizen." Rogers agreed, saying the

The question of a property qualification

[13] Debates III—694; XI-, 297; Public Ledger, January 1, 3, 5, 8, 12, 13, 18, 1838; Mss., Ritner, January 1, 1838; June 28, 1837 (at the State Library); Chambersburg Whig, August 10, 1838.

[14] In 1828, there were still seventy-six slaves in Pennsylvania; in Philadelphia County there were five slaves, and in Philadelphia city there was one slave. In no county were there more than fourteen slaves at this time.

right of suffrage was trammeled upon with more rigor in Pennsylvania than in any other state. He thought that we ought to have a tax qualification, otherwise the paupers in the poor-houses who were a county charge could say to what amount the property holders should pay a tax. Martin of Philadelphia disagreed. He did not want the Blacks to vote and thus become eligible to office. It was necessary to insert the word "free," unless the convention intended to deceive the Southern Negroes; "there are no feelings of equality in this convention, therefore, we should not make the Blacks think there is." We should not hold out expectations to the Blacks which could never be realized. Therefore the word "white" should be inserted. He would move the tax qualification by inserting the words "liable to be taxed." In contrast, Earl of Philadelphia said: "Man is man and who is more?" Those who held that some were men and others were less, had tried to introduce distinctions into society. All experience had shown that if any portion of the community was deprived of any political right, the Republic must fall. The intention of the framers was to make this government an absolute democracy—and that was by establishing universal suffrage. All exclusions were pernicious, because they were oppressive as opposed to the natural equality of man, which is declared in our Declaration of Independence. Every man should vote without the tax qualification's being necessary. Think of a poor Revolutionary soldier who was unable through poverty to pay a tax —should he be excluded? Brown thought the tax qualifications useless. We should have a uniform system of registry. He asked —should every freeman vote? Every human being which resided here, except slaves, is a freeman. If a negro is a human being and not a baboon, and is not a slave, then he is entitled to vote. A free negro is the freest thing on earth—his freedom is unrestrained and irrepressible. Free coloured men had voted. Are all the negroes in Pennsylvania to be turned loose on

election days—the five thousand in the city and county of Philadelphia degraded and debased as nine-tenths of them are? He suggested that we fit the Negro to be free before attempting to emancipate him. The wild and visionary schemes of the abolitionists had thrown the Negro back fifty years. The slaves of the South had been more oppressed in consequence of the efforts of the abolitionists within the last five years than they could receive benefit from the hands of the philanthropists in the next half century. In support, Porter, of Northampton, said: "I am opposed to slavery, but the Abolitionists have defeated their object. But for them, slavery would have been abolished in Maryland before now. It had been prevented by the denunciation of slaveholders as tyrants, man-stealers, etc. Men never acted under the influence of abuse and menace. Cummins said—The Blacks had never been considered as equal citizens. God pronounced that Ham and his descendants should be the servants of servants. History proves that they cannot be raised above their conditions. Here, Stevens dramatically inserted—"the domestic slavery of this country is the most disgraceful institution that the world has ever seen." Martin of Philadelphia said—It is useless to pursue the experiment of making the Indian and the Negro equal to the white citizen. The effort to elevate the Indians turned out a failure. They made no other use of their education than to go from door to door begging for whiskey in Hebrew, Greek and Latin. Any attempt to raise the Negro would also result in failure. If we admit the seven thousand Blacks to the polls at Philadelphia, they will go as they may be directed by some master of intrigue. The clause in the constitution as finally adopted reads: "every white freeman." The word *white* is not in the earlier constitution.[15] The clause concerning the period of residence is amended also. The 1790 constitution required a residence of two years. The amended constitution requires a resi-

The word "white," inserted in the new constitution

[15] In the constitution of 1873, the word, White, is dropped.

dence in the state of one year, and in the election district of ten days. Both constitutions require the payment of a state and county tax—the earlier constitution at least ten days before the election. The later instrument adds a six months' residence. The question as to the day on which elections were to take place was debated for several days. Bell of Chester County said that the delegates who represented the farming districts would want to have the elections take place later than the third Tuesday in October. Read of Susquehanna County went further: he suggested that the time be fixed at the first Monday in November as that would best suit the agricultural interests of his county. Cummins of Juniata said the debate was a great waste of time. The motion to strike out the fourth Tuesday of October and insert the third Tuesday of the same month was agreed to by sixty-seven ayes. In its final form, however, the clause reads the second Tuesday of October just as in the constitution of 1790.[16]

The convention considered at length the subject of representation and apportionment. Keim of Berks opposed increasing the number of representatives. Dunlap of Franklin agreed with Keim and proposed as an amendment that no city or county be entitled to more than six representatives. Sterigere thought that each county ought to have at least one representative. Dickey of Beaver was opposed to the principle of representation of territory. The only fair principle was a tax upon the inhabitants regardless of arbitrary county lines. Earle moved that the one-hundredth part of the taxable population of the state should be taken as the ratio of representation. Each representative district should have as many representatives as it should contain numbers of times the ratio. Not more than two counties should be united to form a representative district. In its final form, the

Representation and apportionment

[16] In the fourth constitution, general elections are fixed on the Tuesday next following the first Monday of November, instead of on the second Tuesday of October as provided in the Constitutions of 1790 and 1838.

section remains un-amended, and reads as follows: "The senators shall be chosen in districts, to be formed by the legislature. .....When a district shall be composed of two or more counties, they shall be adjoining. Neither the city of Philadelphia, nor any county shall be divided in forming a district. The amended clause reads: "but no district shall be so formed as to entitle it to elect more than two senators.....no city or county shall be entitled to elect more than four senators." Read wanted the districts made as small as possible in order to prevent gerrymandering. [17]

Legislative reforms

Legislative reforms were proposed. Brown of Philadelphia, anxious to see "riders" abolished, submitted this resolution: The legislature should be prohibited from passing in the same act laws relating to subjects unconnected with each other. In a few respects, the constitution of 1838 curtailed the legislature, for example, it took away from this body the right to decree a divorce.

The general aversion to "mammoth monopolies," [18] led to the insertion in the new constitution of this section: "The legislature shall not invest any corporate body or individual with the privilege of taking private property for public use, without requiring such corporation or individual to make compensation

[17] Mss., Ritner, July 4, 1837; American Daily Advertiser, February 7, 1829; Debates, June 3, 1837; The constitutions of 1873 and of 1790.

[18] A memorial against the granting of monopolies was in the ultra dramatic language characteristic of the day: "The sale of monopolies which is a common practice used by some of the Despotic Eastern monarchs to replenish their coffers, and which at some periods has been used by some of the weakest and worst of the kings of Europe to supply their extravagance or necessities when their subjects refused to supply what their caprice or folly might dictate, is a practice inconsistent with the rights of freemen, and was never recognized or anticipated by the sages and hereos of the Revolution. The giving of exclusive privileges for a price either to corporations or individuals is only in general to receive a paltry inconsiderable compensation for privileges belonging to all the freemen in the commonwealth. Besides it is degrading the dignity of a great commonwealth, that her representatives should truckle and bargain away privileges belonging to the people."

to the owners of said property....before such property shall be taken."

There was a general tendency to restrain the powers and prerogative of the executive. We have seen that when Governor Wolf sought a third term in 1835, his opponents even in his own party initiated a movement to limit the term of the Governor. A Montgomery County meeting resolved that a governor's tenure should be restricted to two terms, or six years. In the convention, Brown of Philadelphia introduced a resolution to reduce the governor's term to two years and his eligibility to only four years out of six. The amended draft allows the governor to hold office in six out of any term of nine years, rather then nine in any term of twelve years, as the 1790 constitution had provided.[19] The section concerning the appointing power of the executive was so modified as to require the consent of the senate. Brown wanted to take from the governor the appointment of all officers other than those connected with the state executive departments. This suggestion was objected to by Stevens who feared that the legislature would be tardy in filling vacancies. He added that the duty of the legislature was to enact laws and not to appoint those who are to execute them. "We have a melancholy example in the late contest between the President of the United States and the Senate. Do men desire that such scenes should be enacted in Pennsylvania?" Banks disagreed with Stevens. He said that the United States government had prospered under the system of appointment in conjunction with the Senate. Brown proposed certain radical resolutions restraining the power of the executive. He wanted the governor's veto abolished, or retained only on the condition that there be substituted a provision that three-fifths of both houses should be necessary to pass a law, instead of the two-thirds as at present. The

Executive reforms

[19] In the convention of 1873, the governor's term was increased from three to four years, and the governor made ineligible for a second term.

clause concerning contested elections was slightly amended to provide that in case of the death of the governor, another governor shall be chosen to replace him at the next annual election of representatives unless the vacancy shall occur within three calendar months immediately preceding the next annual election—and if the trial of a contested election shall continue longer than the third Monday of January next ensuing the election of governor, the governor of the last year or the Speaker of the Senate shall act as governor.

Judicial Tenure

In the convention it was said that the settlement of the question of Judicial Tenure would mean the accomplishment of all that the people wished. Life office was objected to as aristocratical and odious. A resolution was introduced to limit the term of office of the judges of the Supreme Court to five years, one judge to be appointed annually. The appointments should be by the joint vote of both houses of the legislature. Two sections were inserted in the new constitution: They provide that Prothonotaries of the Supreme Court shall be appointed by said court for the term of three years. Section seven provides that justices of the peace shall be elected in the several wards—and shall be commissioned by the governor for a term of five years. [20]

The question of Free Masonry

Another question much discussed, but which in no way amended the earlier constitution was that of Free Masonry. Stevens wanted a committee appointed on the subject of secret societies and extra-judicial oaths. Doran of Philadelphia wanted inserted after the word societies, "especially Anti-Masonry," but Banks thought "the subject should be let alone." Bell agreed, saying he wished that nothing be introduced into the constitution that was not of a fundamental character. [21] Stevens assured the

[20] Chester County Democrat, January 13, 1835; Debates III—703; IV—287.

[21] The Anti-Masonic convention of Pennsylvania in session at the same time, sent remonstrances to the state constitutional convention against secret societies. They wanted a provision in the new constitution against the administering of unlawful and extra judicial oaths.

members that they could not hope to gain time by smothering inquiry. Brown of Philadelphia said that Antimasonry was a political disease which would soon pass away. The proposition of Stevens was not one which should be brought before a convention. We might just as well discuss the rise and progress of Whiggery, or the rise of the crusade against the Catholic religion. We care nothing about the question. He said that he soon expected to witness an attempt to disfranchise the Roman-Catholics. Crawford could not see that any good would proceed from such an inquiry. Dunlap said that Masonry was fast becoming a delapidated order. Doran agreed that Masonry was entirely unconnected with political objects. He added—Washington and LaFayette were Masons. Therefore, Masonry could not be inimical to civil or religious liberty. Masonry, then, had nothing to fear from a full and free inquiry. In its final form the constitution is silent on the subject.

Among a few delegates there was evinced an earnest desire for reform. It had long been realized that the sale of Lottery tickets was in itself an evil.[22] That such a practice should re- **Lotteries**
ceive the authorization of the state was a matter that awakened the serious consideration of certain of the revisionists. Sterigere moved to add this section: "No lottery shall be authorized by the legislature, and the sale of lottery tickets shall be prohibited under such penalties as shall be imposed by law." No such clause was incorporated in the new constitution.

Reformers wanted the practice of duelling abolished. Dar-

[22] Sergeant had pointed out in Congress that those persons who bought lottery tickets could not afford to sustain the inevitable loss, whereas "the prosperous people did not dabble in them at all." Lotteries had no doubt caused poverty. "High prizes were few and far between." One person, who had sold "thousands and thousands of dollars worth in seven years, said he never sold but one single quarter of a ticket that drew a high prize." He said, "I believe the chances for a man's being killed by lightning are much greater than for drawing a prize."

lington offered a resolution which was laid on the table and eventually not adopted. It urged that a committee be instructed to inquire whether any disqualification for holding office should attach to any person on account of his having been concerned in any duel either as principal or second. Ingersoll, strange to say, encouraged and countenanced duelling. A newspaper of the day states that duelling is a barbarous custom, and suggests that courts of honor be instituted instead, thereby establishing a thorough system of mutual protection. The practice was eventually discountenanced by a sufficient number in the convention, and the new constitution does contain a provision against duelling. [23]

Duelling

The question of the observance of the Sabbath was discussed with due respect. Konigmaker of Lancaster presented a memorial from the Seventh Day Baptist Society of Franklin County, urging the adoption of a constitutional provision for the enforcement of the Sabbath. Contrary petitions were offered against providing any additional regulations to enforce such observance. The convention eventually realized that further legislation on this topic was hardly needed in Pennsylvania.

Observance of the Sabbath

The question of the treatment of Conscientious Objectors [24] received attention when the debate concerned compulsory militia training. Quakers petitioned the convention, hoping that the delegates would "make such provision for the religious scruples of tender consciences as shall be evident," adding, "it is merely a concession to Christian principle, not limited to any classes or persons." On receipt of such a memorial, one delegate asked: "Can the Quakers conscientiously ask for protection when they refuse to furnish means?" Bell, on the contrary, said—"The

Conscientious objectors

[23] Mss., Ritner, May 24, 1837 (at the State Library); American Daily Advertiser, February 5, 1829; The Palladium, June 11, 1832; Debates I—128; Public Ledger, March 19, 1838.

[24] There were four classes of citizens in Pennsylvania conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms: Friends, Menonites, Ominists, and Dunkers.

man is no better fitted to use his arms after he has performed service in the military trainings than he was before he attended them. (Military training camps were then located at Plattsburg and at Baltimore). Other delegates thought militia trainings were not in times of peace productive of beneficial results. Jenks said—"There naturally exists in the minds of American citizens an aversion to coercion and military restraint in times of peace when the necessity for military discipline is too distant to be realized.....Freemen will not in times of peace endure military restraint." Many thought that those who conscientiously scrupled to bear arms should not be compelled to do so, but should pay an equivalent for personal service. Finally, it was decided the whole discussion was superfluous, being provided for in the Federal Constitution. [25]

A question of great importance which like the others, was productive of no amendment [26] was that concerning Public Schools. The question had been increasing in importance; in the year 1827 no less than 1272 children had received free education in schools in Chester County alone. In this year, the Infant School Society of Philadelphia was formed. In Philadelphia County, in the year 1829, more than four thousand pupils attended public schools. They were taught reading, "writing on paper," arithmetic, grammar, and geography. The girls were instructed in sewing, knitting and marking on canvass. In September of this year at a meeting in Philadelphia for the Honest Men of All Parties, the speaker lamented "the ignorance of the masses, who were unrepresented," and begged the audience to "vote for those men only who will support state education." He

Public Schools

[25] The fourth state constitution, that of 1873, exempts from military duty those who have conscientious scruples against bearing arms. Public Ledger, January 1, 1838, January 11, 12, 1838; Debates IV—59 et seq.

[26] The clause upon education was so amended in the fourth constitution as to provide for the education of all the children of the state over six years of age.

urged them "to cast aside party feelings, and ask not if your candidate be a Mason of an Antimason, a Federalist or a Democrat." Although the question figured largely in politics, support of the measure was comparatively independent of party lines. Stevens strongly supported the meaure, and yet those who were his party followers along other lines opposed him on this issue. Darlington, in accord with Stevens on other questions, offered technical objections. Wolf, on the other hand, approved the bill which established Common Schools, and at the same time the majority of his followers among the Germans vigorously opposed the measure, while Anti-Jackson newspapers such as "The Susquehanna Register," rejoiced at Wolf's action.[27]

German opposition to the school law was manifested in meetings and in petitions to the convention. In Berks County, anti-school meetings were frequent. In Union County, especially at New Berlin, the "aristocratic school law" was strenuously opposed. In Strasburg, in Lancaster County, attempts were made to put down the common school system. Konigmacker, of Ephrata, said, "the school system has always been defeated in this district by the arbitrary measures of the rich, avaricious land owners, who are too ignorant to see the benefits of the provisions of the School Law." When it was claimed that the Germans wanted only their own schools, Cunningham of Mercer County declared, "that the German citizens of this county did not care anything about German schools and that they did not ask for them." Against this, the Germans of Mercer County remonstrated and got up a memorial to contradict the assertion of their delegate, which stated, "The Germans in this county are as much alive to the cause of education (German) as any other portion of the citizens of Pennsylvania, and they claim it as their right that

German instruction

[27] The Constitution of 1873; Documents of Schulze's Administration, Harrisburg, 1827; Political Pamphlets, 1829; American Daily Advertiser, February 28, 1859; Chester County Democrat, May 3, November 25, 1834.

a portion of the public treasure should be employed for their benefit.'' The question of German instruction in the *public schools* received attention in the convention. Memorials prayed that provision be made for the promotion of the German language.[28] Scott presented a petition from the city and county of Philadelphia praying for a provision in the constitution requiring instruction in the German language to be given in the public schools. Fleming of Lycoming presented a petition praying for a constitutional provision requiring the election of officers who can speak the German as well as the English language. The matter, of course, received no place in the new constitution. The state, however, paid for the printing of the debates in German as well as in English. The editor of the Deutsche National Zeitung received payment from the state for the publication of the amended constituion in twenty-five numbers of his paper.[29]

Internal Improvements

The problem of Internal Improvements as in the case of most of the important questions of the day, did not escape discussion. The advantages accruing from the system of a non-materialistic tone were alluded to when it was pointed out that the system would result in the interchange of intelligence and ''do away with those natural prejudices which have been the disgrace of Pennsylvania.'' In the fall, Sergeant and the members of the convention were invited to be present on the occasion of the opening of the Cumberland Valley Railroad between the Susquehanna River and Chambersburg.

Few of the many problems discussed received a place in the final draft of the new constitution, although the Bucks County Intelligencer and the American Volunteer might argue that the amendments were real and substantial reforms, it was generally

[28] Copies of ''Stimme des Volks'' were distributed among members of the convention.

[29] Mss., Ritner, February 8, 1836, January 20, April 25, 1838 (at the State Library); Letter from John Keck to J. C. Ingersoll, October 15, 1838; Public Ledger, January 11, 12, 1838.

Ratification of the new constitution

recognized in the convention itself that "the alterations were few in number and simple in character." Such as they were, they were submitted to the people for ratification; some of the delegates were in favor of submitting the constitution not in parts, but "en masse." Sergeant, however, wanted the amendments sent out separately. The new document was considered by the people as a completed product. The amendments were published and submitted at the general election of October 9, 1838. The vote for the amendments was 113,971. No less than 112,759 votes were recorded against the new constitution. Such were the facts as certified by the Speaker of the Senate, Charles B. Penrose. In Philadelphia city and county, the vote was 8,347 for, and 12,429 against the constitution.

The new constitution stood forth almost an exact prototype of the earlier instrument which it had sought to amend. The changes, few and unimportant, convey no intimation of the lengthy debates which lasted many months. Frequently throughout the long sessions, the delegates threatened to withdraw. At the end of the first six weeks, petitions by the score arrived advising adjournment. But Porter of Northampton urged the delegates to "stay and carry out the views of the people." He said, "Gentlemen need not flatter themselves that the people will be satisfied with having the old constitution sent back to them. The people have decided that this constitution shall be amended. What, then, are we doing? We take up matters in their order, and a discussion arises and some gentleman introduces some novel topic—such, for example, as that forty thousand voters did not vote for the call of this convention, and were consequently opposed to constitutional reform, and that, therefore, we are seting (sic) here in violation of the public will—another gentleman contends that the powers of the convention are derived from certain acts of the legislature, and that our sphere of action is limited." No doubt, much time was needlessly lost in arguments

which even the delegates themselves recognized as futile. But of such is the nature of conventions. Perhaps the delegates did not realize the significance of their task, and supported members only with reference to their party politics. But, after all, as a contemporary observes, those disinterested individuals, who accept a seat to render service to their country are, "like angels' visits, few and far between." True, these delegates solved few of the many questions which they debated at length; but some of these problems still await solution even at our hands. [30]

[30] Debates—VIII—243; Mss., Ritner, November 10, 1837 (at the State Library); American Volunteer, May 10, 1838; Debates, II, 147.

APPENDIX A

The division of Philadelphia city and county into Districts for representation in the state legislature, and in Congress:

The First District which sent one representative to Congress comprised: Moyamensing, East and West Southwark, Passyunk, Kingsessing, Blockly, Penn, Germantown, Roxborough, Bristol.

The Second District which sent two representatives to Congress comprised the city proper, which was bounded by the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, and by Vine and South Streets.

The Third District, which was entitled to one representative in Congress, comprised the rest of the county of Philadelphia, including: The Northern Liberties, East and West Kensington, Spring Garden, Oxford, Lower Dublin, Byberry, Moreland.

In the Pennsylvania legislature, the county of Philadelphia had one senator and eight representatives; the city of Philadelphia had seven representatives.

In the administration of the city there were five members of the Select Council and twenty members of the Common Council.

APPENDIX B

A list of the governors of the period, with their political affiliation, and the number of votes cast for them:

1823—Shulze—Democrat—89,998
Gregg—Federal—64,211
1826—Shulze—Democrat—72,710
Sergeant—Federal—1175—no regularly organized opposition
1829—Wolf—Democrat—78,219
Ritner—51,776
1832—Wolf—91,355
Ritner—Federal and Anti-Mason—88,165
1835—Ritner—94,128
Wolf—65,814
Muhlenberg—40,846
1838-1844—Porter—Democrat

APPENDIX C

Pennsylvania Senators:

I. D. Barnard—1827-1831
George M. Dallas—1831-1833
William Wilkins—1831-1834
James Buchanan—1834-1845
Samuel McKean—1833-1839
Daniel Sturgeon—1839-1851

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Letters in Manuscript

A. Official Papers, preserved at the State Library, Harrisburg

1. Governors' Papers

a. The Shulze Papers (1828—December, 1829)

Useful for a detailed study of internal improvement projections. The papers throw light on the difficulties, which the state experienced in financing the undertaking; they enumerate the loans placed throughout the state, and in England.

b. The Wolf Papers

Contain the correspondence of the Governor with state officials and local politicians.

c. The Ritner Papers

Furnish material for the study of the constitutional convention.

B. Private Correspondence

1. Political Letters

a. Letters preserved in the autograph collections at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

1. The Buchanan Papers—1827-1835

These letters reveal the electioneering methods employed by the Democrats to carry the state. While abroad, Buchanan received letters detailing the political complexion of almost every locality in the state.

2. The Coryell Papers

Contain letters of local political interest.

3. Letters of Thaddeus Stevens

A scant collection and, for this paper, useful only in supplementing the well-known fact of Stevens's attitude on the question of Masonry.

4. The letters of George Wolf

   Differ from those preserved at Harrisburg in giving an intimate view of the ulterior motives guiding many of Wolf's party-workers.

5. The Ritner letters also are more personal and confidential than those to be found in the State Library.

b. Letters preserved in the manuscript department of the Library or Congress:

1. The Jackson Papers

   Contain letters from Pennsylvania politicians describing the political situation in their state.

2. The Van Buren Papers

   The Magician was evidently interested in Pennsylvania politics. The letters throw light on the confusion incident to the Democratic misfortunes of 1835.

3. The Stevens Collection

   Is scant for this period. Again, as in the case of the Philadelphia collection, the letters indicate Stevens's sincerity on the issue of Anti-Masonry.

c. The Charles Roberts Autograph Collection of Haverford College

   Is of general interest; but was of little use in preparing this paper. The peculiar arrangement to which the custodian has subjected these letters is exasperating, and renders their use difficult.

II. Published Correspondence

A. John Bassett Moore—The Works of James Buchanan, 1908

B. Calvin Colton—Life, Correspondence and Speeches of Henry Clay—in six columns—1864

III. Documents

A. Federal

1. Annals of Congress—Senate, February, 1811

   Depicts the earlier attitude of parties on the question of the United States Bank.

2. American State Papers—Finance 11

Contains petitions to Congress from Pennsylvania citizens and from the state legislature, regarding the United States Bank, and the Tariff.

3. Congressional Documents—Volume 1—1836, pages 359-391, number 79

Contains an abstract from the returns of the Banks in Pennsylvania for 1836; 25th Congress, 2d session. House of Representatives.

B. State Documents

1. Ames, H. V., State Documents on Federal Relations, 1911.
2. Journals of the House of Representatives, Pennsylvania, 1827-1836.
3. Compilation of the laws of Pennsylvania relative to Internal Improvements, Harrisburg, 1840.
4. Report of the Canal Commissioners, 1825-1835.
5. Pennsylvania Archives—Papers of the Governors—Volumes V and VI.
6. Debates of the Pennsylvania Constitution Convention, 1837-1838.

They reflect the political life of the state, shed-light on various unrelated problems from the constitutional position of the Governor, to the status of the Negro.

IV. Newspapers

A. On file in the State Library at Harrisburg

1. Pennsylvania Intelligencer and Farmers' and Mechanics' Journal, published at Harrisburg; National-Republican.
2. Anti-Masonic Herald and Lancaster Weekly Courier, published at New Holland, Lancaster County.

Their motto was "Veritas Vincit." Their politics were National Republican; they were bitterly opposed to Wolf and to Buchanan.

3. The Democratic State Journal

This paper became in 1836 The Daily Reporter and Journal, and still later, The Reporter and

State Journal, an intolerant sheet, anti-Bank and anti-Catholic, tenacious in its adherence of Muhlenberg against Wolf. Its editorials are misleading and unreliable. But its columns are rich in quotations from other state papers, thus serving to remind one of our Literary Digest, from which it differs, however, in that its quotations are partisan in interpretation, though not necessarily in selection.

4. The Harrisburg Intelligencer

A pro-Clay paper, interested in national rather than in local affairs, thus contrasting with the State Journal. Both papers were published at Harrisburg.

5. The Lancaster Union, Whig, published at Lancaster.

6. The Statesman

This paper referred to itself as an independent Antimasonic publication; but, in fact, it was strongly in favor of Ritner, of the American System, and of the Bank. Its motto was: "In defence of Virtue and Truth, we fearlessly expose Vice and False-hood." Beginning with the issue of September 21, 1831, The Statesman is bound with the files of The Pennsylvania Telegraph. Both were published at Harrisburg.

7. Pennsylvania Telegraph

Supported Ritner and Antimasonry, and opposed Wolf.

8. The Harrisburg Chronicle.

In 1828, strongly Jacksonian, though at the same time Antimasonic. In 1830-31, the paper became bitter against the Antimasons whom they regarded as "only a political party allied against the Democrats."

9. The Whig—Chambersburg.

Strongly favoring the United States Bank of Pennsylvania; they enunciated States' Rights doctrines.

10. The Allegheny Democrat, and Farmers' and Mechanics' Advertiser, Pittsburg

A pro-Wolf paper. They characterized Clay as a political gambler and demagogue. While pro-

Jackson, they were bitter against Van Buren—"a man of low cunning and intrigue." Later, they supported Van Buren.

11. American Volunteer, Carlisle, Pennsylvania

A paper rich in political comment; in politics—bitter against Ritner, Antimasonry and the Bank. They supported Wolf rather than Muhlenberg.

12. Chronicle of the Times, Reading, Pennsylvania.

A conservative sheet, containing comparatively little of political interest. They opposed the Bank, supported the School Law, and promoted the interests of Muhlenberg as against those of Wolf. They opposed the Abolitionists.

13. Harrisburg Argus

Under the motto "The best palladium of the peoples' liberties is the liberty of the Press," they devoted their columns to the cause of the American System, and of "the administration of the United States as guided by John Quiney Adams." Of Masonry, they said, "It is an order which we are not acquainted with or attached to." When the Adams issue was dead in 1828, and after the National-Republican defeat of 1829, the "Argus" became an out and out Antimasonic sheet. July 4, 1829, marks the last issue under the name "Argus." On July 11, of the same year, the editor, Francis Wyeth, brought out The Republican and Anti-Masonic Inquirer.

B. Files preserved at the Historical Society at Lancaster

1. The Columbia Spy, Columbia, Pennsylvania

This paper supported Clay and internal improvements, but opposed the Bank. It was interested in abolition and Negro colonization.

2. The Bethania Palladium, Bethania, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania

A Whig paper that was Abolitionistic in sentiment.

3. The Crawford Democrat and Northwestern Advertiser, Meadville, Pennsylvania—Later called the Crawford Democrat and Meadville Courier.

It was pro-Wolf and Anti-Bank.

4. The Marietta Advocate, and Farmers' and Mechanics' Intelligencer.

A pro-Jackson paper of small value for political news.

C. Files preserved at the Historical Museum at Doylestown—called The Bucks County Historical Society

1. The Bucks County Intelligencer

A Whig paper. In 1827 it supported Adams and the policy of internal improvements; later it was interested in the Tariff and in Clay. Published at Doylestown.

2. The Chronicle of the Times—Democratic.

Published at Doylestown.

D. Files preserved at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

1. The American Republican and Chester County Democrat

Bitter against the United States Bank. Published at West Chester.

2. The United States Gazette

The chief organ of the National-Republicans. Published at Philadelphia.

3. The Pennsylvanian—Philadelphia

Democrat.

4. Philadelphia Daily Chronicle

Democrat.

E. Files preserved at the Philadelphia Library Company

1. The Norristown Herald and Weekly Advertiser—published by David Sower—National-Republican.

F. Files preserved at the University of Pennsylvania

1. Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, Philadelphia.

This paper is also to be found at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. It is bound with the files of the National Gazette, and is of special interest on the question of canals and roads, although opposing Clay and supporting Jackson.

2. Samuel Hazard—The Register of Pennsylvania, Vol. 1, 1828.

3. Niles Register

A familiar store house of information on every conceivable topic.

V. Pamphlets

A. A group chronologically arranged and preserved at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania

B. A group bound together under the title "Bank of the United States," 1822-1841—at the University of Pennsylvania

C. A large number of loose pamphlets on various subjects relating to the political life of the state

VI. British Contemporary Publications

A. The London Times, 1832, comments on the Veto and Bank question, and on Internal Improvements.

B. The Edinburgh Review—Vols. 56, 60, 61, 63, 69, 86,—The Review considers the Pennsylvania system of constructing canals and railroads, and comments favourably on the system of construction by the state as against the system of private control obtaining in England.

C. The Quarterly Review—1830.

D. The Annual Register—September, 1831.

E. Parliamentary Papers, 1845.

F. Debates—Commons, April 26, 1836.

VII. Special Works and Miscellaneous Contributions

A. A. D. Harlan—The Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention, 1872-1873, Philadelphia, 1873

Harlan was the second assistant clerk of the Convention.

B. J. S. Walton, Nominating Conventions in Pennsylvania—American Historical Review, January, 1897

The origin and development of the convention and how it superceded the caucus as a regular nominating body.

C. M. Ostrogorski—The Rise and Fall of the Nominating

Caucus, Legislative and Congressional—American Historical Review, January, 1900

D. Charles McCarthy—The Anti-Masonic Party—1827-1840—Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1902—Vol. I

E. John Thom Holdsworth—The First Bank of the United States—published as Senate Document No. 571, sixty-first Congress, second session

F. Ralph C. H. Catterall—The Second Bank of the United States, 1903

G. A. E. Parkins—The Development of Transportation in Pennsylvania—The Bulletin of the Geographical Society of Philadelphia, 1916-1917

H. James M. Swank—Progressive Pennsylvania, 1908

I. Thomas Cooper and Hector Fenton—American Politics—Boston, 1889

J. Alexander K. McClure—Old Time Notes of Pennsylvania—in two volumes, Philadelphia, 1905—Vol. I

K. John Bach McMaster—The Life and Times of Stephen Girard, 1918

L. Biographies

1. Hampton, L. Carson—Horace Binney, 1907.
2. Charles Chauncey Binney—The Life of Horace Binney, 1903.
3. William M. Meigs—The Life of Charles Jared Ingersoll, 1897.
4. James Albert Woodburn—The Life of Thaddeus Stevens—Indianapolis, 1913.
5. G. Ticknor Curtis—Life of James Buchanan—two volumes (1883).